DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 511 CS 013 876

AUTHOR	Palmer, Barbara Martin, Ed.
TITLE	College Reading: Perspectives and Practices. The College Reading Association Monograph Series.
INSTITUTION	College Reading Association.
ISBN	ISBN-1-883604-27-3
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	99p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College Reading Association, 113 Danny Dr., Apt. F., Carrollton, GA 30117-7534. Web site: http://explorers.tsuniv.edu/cra.
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Computer Uses in Education; Higher Education; Principals; *Reader Response; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Writing Relationship; *Teacher Education; *Undergraduate Students; Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS	College Reading and Study Skills Inventory

ABSTRACT

This book addresses reading issues pertaining to college students at all levels, and is envisioned as an essay collection of interest to educators involved with college reading, as well as those in other disciplines. Section 1 (Perspectives) presents 4 essays, which describe how college readers perceive reading and writing: "'Josh': Case Study of an Underprepared College Student in a Response-Centered Composition Classroom" (Evangeline Newton); "Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books" (Marguerite Cogorno Radencich); "Whole Language: A Survey of a College Population" (Latty L. Goodwin); and "The Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies of College Freshmen and College Seniors" (Barbara Martin Palmer). Section 2 (Practices) presents 2 essays, which address a way of changing teacher education through journaling, and the relationship between electronic conferencing and the reading, writing and thinking of community college readers: "University and Classroom Conversations: Transformative Education Found, Lost, and Found Again" (Nina Zaragoza, Jane Devick, and Deborah Beam); and "Factors Associated with Computer-Mediated Pre-Writing and Reading Activities" (Bob Lucking, Ray Morgan, and Ann Woolford-Singh). (Contains approximately 120 references.) (EF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

College Reading: Perspectives and Practices

ED 438 511

CS 013 876

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Shaffer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Barbara Martin Palmer, *Editor*

The College Reading Association Monograph Series

CRA

1999

2

College Reading: Perspectives and Practices

Barbara Martin Palmer, Editor
Mount Saint Mary's College
Emmitsburg, MD

The College Reading Association Monograph Series
1999

Copyright 1999 The College Reading Association

Photocopy/Reprinting Permission Statement

Permission is hereby granted to professors and teachers to reprint or photocopy any article in the Monograph for use in their classes, provided each copy made shows the copyright notice. Such copies may not be sold, and further distribution is expressly prohibited. Except as authorized above, prior written permission must be obtained from the College Reading Association to reproduce or transmit this work or portions thereof in any other form or by another electronic or mechanical means, including any information storage or retrieval system, unless expressly permitted by federal copyright law. Address inquiries to the College Reading Association, Gary Shaffer, 113 Danny Drive, Apt. F, Carrollton, GA 30117-7534.

ISBN 1-883604-27-3

Printed by
The Sheridan Press
Hanover, PA

COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION BOARD MEMBERS 1998-1999

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

President, Nancy Padak, Kent State University

President-Elect, Jack Cassidy, Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi

Vice-President-Elect, Maria Valeri-Gold, Georgia State University

Past President, Timothy Rasinski, Kent State University

Executive Secretary, Linda Thistlethwaite, Western Illinois University

Treasurer/Business Manager, Gary L. Shaffer, State University of West Georgia

Directors

Robert Rickelman, University of North Carolina-Charlotte

Gwendolyn Turner, University of Missouri-St. Louis

Donna Alvermann, University of Georgia

Wayne M. Linek, Texas A & M University-Commerce

Betty Sturtevant, George Mason University

Maria Valeri-Gold, Georgia State University

Barbara Walker, Oklahoma State University

Judy Richardson, Virginia Commonwealth

Marino Alvarez, Tennessee State University

Division Chairs

Adult Learning, Sarah Nixon-Ponder, Southern Missouri State University

Clinical, Madlyn L. Hanes, Penn State-Great Valley

College Reading, Phyllis Kremen, Rutgers University

Teacher Education, Joan Elliott, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Editors

Reading Research and Instruction, Robert Rickelman, University of North Carolina-Charlotte; Samuel Miller, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Ernest Dishner and William Henk, Penn State Harrisburg, Capital College

The Reading News, Ellen Jampole, State University of New York at Cortland

Monograph, Barbara Martin Palmer, Mount Saint Mary's College

Yearbook, Elizabeth Sturtevant, George Mason University; Wayne Linek, JoAnn Dugan, and Patricia Linder, Texas A & M University-Commerce

Committee Chairs

Conference, Maria Valeri-Gold, Georgia State University

Program, Jack Cassidy, Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi

Membership, Peggy Daisey, Eastern Michigan University; Cindy Gillespie, Bowling Green University

Professional Affairs, Michael Martin, University of Southern Mississippi

Public Information, Jane Matanzo, Florida Atlantic University

Awards, Timothy Rasinski, Kent State University

Media, Nancy Bertrand, Middle Tennessee State University; John Bertrand, Tennessee State University

Historian, J. Estill Alexander, University of Tennessee Emeritus

Photographer, Frederick Fedorko, East Stroudsburg University

Research, Evangeline Newton, University of Akron; Jacqueline Peck, Cleveland State University

Elections, Marino Alvarez, Tennessee State University

Resolutions & Rules, William Dee Nichols, University of North Carolina-Charlotte; John Helfeldt, University of Arkansas

Publications, Michael McKenna, Georgia Southern University

Legislative & Social Issues, Betty Goerss, Indiana University East; Carolyn Walker, Ball State University

MONOGRAPH EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mary Agnew
Fort Valley State University

Monica Gordon Pershey
Cleveland State University

Cathy Leist
University of Louisville

Dianne M. Truscott
Buffalo State University (SUNY)

Linda Lewis-White
Eastern Michigan University

CONTENTS

Preface
Barbara Martin Palmer

Perspectives

"Josh": Case Study of an Underprepared College Student in a Response-Centered Composition Classroom *1*
Evangeline Newton

Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books *20*
Marguerite Cogorno Radencich

Whole Language: A Survey of a College Population *34*
Latty L. Goodwin

The Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies of College Freshmen and College Seniors *46*
Barbara Martin Palmer

Practices

University and Classroom Conversations: Transformative Education Found, Lost, and Found Again *73*
Nina Zaragoza, Jane Devick, Deborah Beam

Factors Associated with Computer-Mediated Pre-Writing and Reading Activities *84*
Bob Lucking, Ray Morgan, Ann Woolford-Singh

Preface

What do you think of when you hear the term "college reading"? For many it is synonymous with developmental studies. I have been teaching college readers for nearly half of my teaching career and I define "college reading" more broadly. Some of the college readers I taught were indeed first-year students in my Developmental Reading and Study Skills classes at Frederick Community College and some of them were first-year students in my Freshman Seminar years later at Mount Saint Mary's College. Some of them were and are college juniors and seniors that I teach in our pre-service elementary education program. Still others are adult learners in my graduate literacy methods course. All are college readers. Nearly all have had questions about reading or concerns about their own reading practices.

When I first envisioned *College Reading: Perspectives and Practices* I envisioned a volume that would be of interest to members of each of the divisions of the College Reading Association—Adult Learning, Clinical, College Reading, and Teacher Education—as well as our colleagues in other disciplines. Let me tell you about the contents of the monograph. There are two sections. In Section One, *Perspectives,* you will learn how college readers perceive reading and writing. Evangeline Newton presents a profile of one college reader as he makes meaning from text in *"Josh": Case Study of an Underprepared College Student in a Response-Centered Composition Classroom.* Marguerite Cogorno Radencich studied the images her pre-service teachers derived from reading excerpts of text in *Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books.* Latty Goodwin captured the perspective of students enrolled in a developmental communications course at the beginning and end of the semester in her study *Whole Language: A Survey of a College Population.* In the last chapter, I report the results of my dissertation study: *The Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies of College Freshmen and College Seniors.*

Section Two is called *Practices.* In it you will learn how Nina Zaragoza, Jane Devick, and Deborah Beam worked to change the face of teacher education via journaling in *University and Classroom Conversations: Transformative Education Found, Lost, and Found Again.* In the final chapter Bob Lucking, Ray Morgan, and Ann Woolford-Singh explore the relationship between electronic conferencing and the reading, writing, and thinking of community college readers.

College Reading: Perspectives and Practices is the creation of many. I thank the Editorial Board for its thoughtful and timely reviews of the manuscripts; the Publications Committee for its support and guidance, particularly past chairman Bill Henk for accepting my proposal and present chairman Mike McKenna for seeing it through to completion; and of course, the authors for sharing my view that "college reading" merits our attention.

One final note: *Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books* by Marguerite Cogorno Radencich is being published posthumously. I can think of no better way to honor our colleague!

Barbara Martin Palmer, Ph.D.
Editor
Mount Saint Mary's College

Perspectives

"Josh": Case Study of an Underprepared College Student in a Response-Centered Composition Classroom

Evangeline Newton
University of Akron

Josh was a struggling reader and writer in one university composition classroom using response-based instructional strategies to teach literature. This article will share results of a qualitative case study which described how Josh constructed meaning from literary text through analysis of his written and oral discourse over one semester. Findings relate to Josh's understanding of purpose, use of information sources, and view of context. Besides discussing pedagogical implications for instructors of underprepared or at-risk university students, the study raises intriguing questions about the teacher-student relationship in a response-centered classroom.

Introduction

Contemporary research has established that reading is the active construction of meaning as a reader transacts with a text (Rosenblatt, 1978, 1983; Smith, 1994). Research has also established that writing is the active construction of meaning as a writer engages with an emerging text (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Petrosky, 1982). In addition, the reading and writing processes are now seen as interactive and symbiotic (Pearson & Tierney, 1984; Shanahan & Lomax, 1988). They are also perceived as sociopsycholinguistic processes, influenced by institutional and cultural phenomenon (Bloome, 1985; Bloome & Green, 1984). This vision of reading and writing has focused research attention on the behavior and disposition of learners who monitor the meaning-making process through their interaction with texts in contexts.

In university classrooms, some scholars (Bleich, 1978; Mailloux, 1990; Rosenblatt, 1978, 1983) have advanced theories of teaching literature which are pedagogically consistent with new insights about the reading and writing processes. These "reader-centered," "response," or "reader response" theorists share a belief that readers are the primary agents in the construction of textual meaning. They acknowledge a variety of influences on textual interpretation, and endorse investigation of these meaning sources as a legitimate academic enterprise. But although reader-centered theorists have influenced some classroom practices, there has been little in-depth study of how these practices impact on individual students over the course of a semester (Cooper, 1985; Martinez & Roser, 1991; Squire, 1994).

Josh was a struggling reader and writer in one university composition classroom using response-based instructional strategies compatible with current literacy theory. This article will share results of a qualitative case study which described how Josh constructed meaning from literary text through analysis of his written and oral

discourse over one semester. After presenting salient background, significant features of Josh's meaning-making behaviors will be shared through a descriptive narrative drawn from his work. Discussion will focus on findings about Josh's understanding of purpose, his inordinate use of text-based information sources, and the pervasive influence of teacher goals on his meaning-making activity. Finally, the article will suggest pedagogical implications of this study for instructors of underprepared or at-risk university students. In addition, it will raise intriguing questions about the teacher-student relationship in a response-centered classroom.

Background and Design

Methodology

According to Bloome and Greene (1984), reading is a "contextualized activity," a phenomenon which influences "both the nature of practice and what is learned" (p. 415). Moreover, lessons are "constructed entities produced by teachers and children as they work together to reach instructional goals" (Green & Harker, 1982, p. 190). Bloome (1985) notes that interactions among participants in a reading event may even alter the intended goals of an academic task. Consequently, I chose a qualitative research paradigm which regards human behavior as multi-faceted and discernable only when explored as it evolves within its customary setting.

Similarly, a qualitative design is compatible with the theories of reading and writing as interactive, dynamic, learner-centered processes upon which this study is based. Since readers construct meaning by relating their prior experience and knowledge to the text in a classroom context, literary interpretation is idiosyncratic and subjective. Finally, a qualitative paradigm sanctions ongoing analysis and recognizes emerging hypotheses as organic and sometimes temporal (Merriam, 1988).

Data Collection and Analysis. This article draws on data collected for a larger study which tracked the literacy behaviors of a fluent ("Mark") and non-fluent ("Josh") reader and writer in a response-based classroom (Newton, 1992). Data included a variety of writing tasks, audiotaped interviews, videotapes of class discussions and my own daily field notes.

Four kinds of writing activities were employed regularly: a) extensive journal writing, particularly the affective-associative heuristic developed by Bleich (1978) (Appendix A); b) formal essays evaluated for a letter grade (Appendix B); c) collaborative classroom exercises (often videotaped); and d) written meta-analysis which frequently followed formal writing assignments, class discussions, or collaborative tasks (Appendix C).

Josh was also interviewed at mid-term by another researcher. When the course ended, he completed an "attitude questionnaire" about his participation in the class (Price, 1990). To triangulate data analysis, categories underwent peer examination and I shared results with Josh in an exit interview. He confirmed my findings.

Data analysis was guided by the following research question: *How does a non-fluent reader and writer construct meaning from print in a response-centered classroom?* Analysis involved three phases: a) data preparation and reduction; b) identification of behavior patterns and development of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967); and c) insuring the validity of results. A software program by Seidel

(1985), *The Ethnograph,* was used to organize data bases and facilitate the inductive analysis process.

The analytical process was inductive, based on identifying behavioral and belief patterns. Glaser and Strauss' (1967) "constant and comparative" method guided this phase as data were coded into categories. Each new piece of data was compared with other data within or across categories. New categories and sub-categories were created until an organizational framework was established. From this framework, I looked for broad domains and specific behavioral patterns from which I developed theories about the research question.

Site. The site was my own freshman composition class at a large midwestern university. Before enrolling in the literature-based second semester class which is the focus of this study, students must have successfully completed a first semester course in which expository prose is the basis for essays. Freshmen like Josh who entered the university with low ACT test scores take a developmental composition course designed to improve inadequate writing skills. Before enrolling in the first sequenced course, they must have also passed an "exit" exam in which they write an in-class essay from a prompt.

Most of the assigned readings were from a conventional freshman literature anthology. Readings included selections from the standard literary canon (e.g., Hemingway, Faulkner), and from established but not yet "canonized" writers (e.g., Olsen, Tyler). Students also read a prose translation of *The Odyssey* (Rieu, 1946) and the drama *A Streetcar Named Desire* (Williams, 1947).

Instructional strategies for achieving curricular goals were based on four assumptions: a) the best way to learn any subject matter is to understand the critical importance of what the learner contributes to the task; b) reading and writing are symbiotic acts of composing meaning; c) by engaging frequently in these activities students will gain insight about literary text; and d) that learning is also a social act, and so by sharing their perceptions learners grow in understanding and mastery of subject matter.

Most classroom time was spent in writing or discussion. Students wrote during almost every class period and shared what they wrote through different classroom forums. They often engaged in small group and collaborative activities where they were asked to share their own literary insights, either through spontaneous discussion or by reading their written assignments to others. In classroom interaction, no text was regarded as "sacred." Students were encouraged to voice their opinions freely, even about "canonized" texts.

"Josh"

Shy and self-conscious, Josh was raised in the suburbs of a large Ohio city, and at the time of this study was a third semester freshman. Although he rarely missed class, Josh always sat in the last seat of the first row and never volunteered an opinion. Yet he would respond when directly addressed and was always punctual with homework assignments. In a biopoem, he described himself as "blue eyes, tall, brown hair, easy going."[1]

[1] Josh's written work has been reproduced here without editing for mechanical error.

Josh wrote that he thought his parents had taught him to read, although he could not recall when or how. His favorite book was *It* because "It kept me in suspence" and his least favorite was *The Grapes of Wrath,* an English assignment he "did not finish." Josh also wrote that "I have to be interested in something to read it."

His journal entries were usually brief and sketchy. Josh noted "I write slow because I have trouble sometimes thinking of what to write down on a paper. My mind goes blank." He believed his "strengths as a writer are that if I am given an assignment I will almost always finish and give an effert."

A few weeks before the semester ended, Josh asked if it was possible for him to earn an "A" in this class. He said that he was having difficulty in other classes, and he needed a strong showing in this class to stay in school.

Results

Data analysis revealed three principal components of Josh's meaning making process: a) his belief that the purpose for reading literature was to "get the meaning"; b) his exclusive use of text-based information sources; and c) his task-focused notion of context as meeting teacher requirements. Following is an abridged narrative of Josh's semester-long experience in this classroom. Examples of his written work highlight components of his meaning-making process.

Attitude Inventory

On the first day of class, Josh was asked to write a letter describing his feelings about the study of literature. He wrote:

> *My feeling on literature are mixed I am not the type of person who picks up a book and reads it. I have to be in a certain mood or have a sense for a book. Basically I have to be interested in something to read it. I always read magazines and the newspaper. I dis like reading books or essays tat are hard to understand like last semester in 1001 english. I do like writing essays that you have to put a lot of thought in or be creative. I do like writing papers were you have to go find information on certain topics, like going to library. These are some of my feeling on literature.*

When Josh declares that his feelings about literature are "mixed," he also reveals some confusion about literature as a disciplinary province. First, Josh appears to equate all book-reading with literature, including "essays tat are hard to understand," "magazines, and "newspapers." Similarly, for Josh the study of literature appears to involve two kinds of writing tasks i.e., those designed to "be creative" or to "find information."

Despite the ambivalent feelings expressed in this letter, Josh was very clear about the goal of reading literature. In fact, data analysis indicated that Josh came into this classroom with one purpose as a reader in school: to "understand" a text's indigenous message. Furthermore, Josh believed this was achieved by "getting meaning" from the text. He observed in his literacy inventory (Judy & Judy, 1983) that reading and writing were not outdated because "you can read something over and over and it has more meaning to you."

To that end, Josh relied mostly on chronological story grammar to reconstruct events depicted in the text so that he could "understand" the deeper "meaning"

behind them. Moreover, Josh focused on individual words to help him. Typically, Josh neither tapped non-text-based information sources nor adapted his meaning-making behaviors to specific interpretive tasks. Instead, he habitually constructed meaning through piecemeal assembly of text-based clues which he hoped would uncover the text's indigenous meaning. Once uncovered, he could give the teacher "what she wanted."

Journal Writing

Two assignments on Roethke's "My Papa's Waltz" highlight his typical meaning-making behaviors. In a journal response to the prompt, "Describe how you felt as you were reading this work," Josh wrote one sentence: "I feel a sence of love between the boy and father in how they were together and dancing." To the follow-up question, "What memories or associations did you experience as you read that may have influenced your affective response?" Josh wrote another sentence, "I associate this poem in the way my family is close and always there." Although the assignment solicits a personal association to facilitate meaning-making, Josh only makes a perfunctory connection.

During the next class session, students assembled in small groups to share their responses and to speculate about whether the father-son relationship depicted in the poem was positive or negative. Following this activity, students wrote a meta-analysis discussing one difference between their perception of the poem and that of other group members. Josh wrote the following:

> —What happened—*In the group we discussed what happened in the poem and told what opinion we had. My opinion was a positive one. There were two negatives and two positives. Everyone one in the group talked about the poem and how they understood it.*
>
> —Different meaning—*I got more information or a better outlook in how the father and son were waltzing. In how they danced with each other and getting more meaning of the words like buckle, countenance and death.*
>
> —One way different from others—*I felt the father had a good relationship with his son in the way he wanted to be with him and how he spent time with him.*

Josh's organization here reflects his perception of purpose in reading as a student: to recreate a text's events ("what happened") so that he could understand their significance ("different meaning") and demonstrate that understanding in order to meet the requirements of this assignment ("one way different from others").

The discussion helped Josh get "more meaning" out of individual words ("buckle," "countenance," and "death") to help him get a "better outlook in how the father and son were waltzing." Most of his interpretive energy, then, is focused on words and suggests a linear or "bottom-up" orientation toward meaning-making: knowledge of words helps him understand events and thus get deeper meaning (Gough, 1972).

Similarly, when he describes group interaction, Josh does not discuss individual opinions or their impact on him. Nor does he explain his beliefs by making personal associations. Instead, he simply reports that there were "two negatives and two

positives." For this reading and writing assignment, then, Josh did not draw heavily on his own life experience or world view.

Evidence of similar dependence on the text abounds. After reading the *Odyssey*, for example, students were asked to discuss their favorite and least favorite characters. Josh wrote:

> *Odysseus was my favorite character because he was the main character and I also liked the way he acted in trying to get home by using his mind.*
> *The Suitors were my least favorite characters because they trashed Odysseus house.*

Although the assignment invites a personal association, it is the text which directs Josh's choice of favorite character: Odysseus was his favorite character because he was "the main character." Next, students were asked to identify and discuss an idea or theme from the *Odyssey* with which they agreed and one with which they disagreed:

> *I agree in the way Odysseus killed off all the Suitors, I disagree in how long it took Odysseus to get home from the war.*

Both his agreement and disagreement with ideas presented in the story focused on plot events, although the "ideas" question invited the reader to develop opinions beyond the parameter of textual events. At any rate, Josh did not develop any of his answers or intrude personal associations or beliefs. In his midterm interview Josh said that the *Odyssey* had been his favorite reading during the first eight weeks of the semester. It was, he said, a "good story."

In fact, Josh appeared so dependent on text to understand story line and thereby determine meaning that unexpected textual patterns threatened his entire meaning-making process. He disliked Hemingway's "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place," because it

> *made me feel confused by all the short sentences that I read. It also did not give a clear picture of what the story was about . . . It was a good story in the sence of how it was written, but it could have been better by given more detail . . .*

Josh relied on the text to give a "clear picture" and "details." But here Josh was confused by "all the short sentences," probably because Hemingway's short story does indeed lack "detail." Perhaps Josh's limited view of story grammar left him confused by an unsequential plot line and consequently unable to predict events. In addition, syntactic predictability was violated by the distinctive Hemingway style. And since Josh did not appear to draw on other non-text-based schema (e.g., past experience with literature or life) to augment his reading process, meaning construction was hampered when the text was "confusing."

Essay writing

As a reader, Josh typically demonstrated this same meaning-making pattern with different interpretive tasks. The first formal essay, for example, was explicitly reader-centered. It asked students to compare an experience of their own to that of a character in a short story the class had read. After identifying the experience,

students were to compare its resolution to that of the fictional experience. Josh decided to compare his experience working in a pet store to Sammy's working in "A & P." His introduction identified areas of comparison he would develop:

> *In comparing A and P by John Updike and an experience of my own there are three aspects to look upon, They are the behavior of the charactor and myself, the setting of the experiences of Sammy and myself, and the choices that Sammy and I had to deal with when at a job, These are some of characteristics that I am going to talk about.*

Although the assignment itself did not specify such an organization, Josh imposed a distinctive "five-paragraph theme" form on the essay. His meaning-making process as both reader and writer, then, was dominated by textual structure. He chose setting, a literary convention, as his first experiential comparison. His discussion presented both physical environments factually, without any personal speculation on their significance for him or to each other:

> *Sammy's took place at a grocery store called A and P located in a small town north of Boston almost by the Cape Code, and was fibe miles away from the beach. My setting took place at a pet store called Hieghts Pet World located on Mayfield road in South Euclid, that is a suburb outside of Cleveland.*

Josh extended the comparison of setting to his and Sammy's respective knowledge of "where everything in the store was located," and their mutual ability "to waste time." And once he had provided the requisite comparison, Josh had met the task requirement.

In fact, his pattern of discussion for each feature was the same: brief personal example followed by direct quotation of a similar instance from the text. (Altogether, Josh's five-page paper included seven quoted passages, each of them several lines long.) No deeper connection was ever drawn between the real-life events and those of the story. Josh's comparison of customer treatment, for example, offered a brief observation from his own experience:

> *In comparing the second aspect the behavior of Sammy and myself there are simularities. Some examples of this when I worked I would wonder why people would buy things that they did not need for there pets, such as medicine for there pets, even though there pets were not sick.*

Sammy's parallel example was quoted directly from the text:

> *Sammy gives an example of this whin he said (page 12) "An old party in baggy gray pants who stumbles up with four giant cans of pineapple juice (what do these bums do with all that pineapple juice? I've often asked myself)".*

Once Josh had cited a textual example, he moved on to the next comparative point. According to my field notes, classroom discussion of this story focused on Sammy's character and ended in a "general class discussion of the appropriateness of dress codes/freedom." Yet there was no evidence that Josh's meaning-making in this essay was influenced by any classroom interaction with the story.

The construction of this essay also demonstrated that Josh made meaning from print and with print in much the same way. As a writer, Josh had imposed a form on this essay and then carefully met its structural obligations. He introduced his topic and indicated three major spheres of comparison. Each sphere had a number of subordinate points, supported with one textual quotation and one parallel from Josh's life:

I. Setting
  A. Grocery and pet store
     example of each
  B. Location of items
     example of each
  C. Slow and active times
     example of each
II. Behavior
  A. People's buying habits
     example of each
  B. Girl watching
     example of each
  C. Identifying which customers would buy
     example of each
  D. Expressing feelings to customers
     example of each
III. Choices
  A. Treatment of customers
     example of each
  B. Quitting job
     example of each

Josh had pieced together this essay much as he pieced together events from the text. He had employed a schema which allowed him to predict a certain meaning-making pattern. Then he had gone to the text to flesh it out with appropriate detail.

In a meta-analysis of his writing process for this essay, Josh was asked, "Did you share your essay with anyone else?" He wrote, "Yes, I had two people proof read it." To the question, "What do you like least about the essay," Josh wrote, "I wish I would have worded some things differently." Again, Josh's meaning-making as a writer was aimed at producing a mechanically and syntactically correct manuscript. He asked outside readers to "proofread" and wished he had "worded things differently." It was a "bottom up" perspective, text-based and skills-driven.

Meeting Teacher Requirements

Technically, "context" for this course was the articulated and perceived goals of a response pedagogy as represented through classroom activities and writing assignments. From the first day, students were invited to express feelings and attitudes openly. I specifically urged them to draw on both personal experience and textual cues, and to share their opinions with one another through small group and whole class activity. But for Josh, "context" meant determining my goals for each writing task, and completing them adequately.

Although journal assignments were intended to provide an opportunity for students to probe their reactions to a literary text, Josh's journal entries were invariably brief and literal answers to task questions. Furthermore, Josh often repeated the same writing pattern in his responses (i.e., "I feel a sence of . . ."). But he did not use those feelings as a catalyst for interpretation or analysis. He appeared to believe that contextual requirements had been satisfied: the teacher asked for feelings, and he had supplied them.

On one journal response I had written "Try to write a minimum of 1 page." Perhaps predictably, Josh's future journal responses almost always filled exactly one page. Josh appeared to see my directive as a literal and, therefore, integral contextual influence; the one-page journal entry became, for him, an internalized assignment goal. During the semester my responses to Josh's journal entries were intended to suggest ways he could make meaning by incorporating personal and text-based information sources (e.g., "Good—Now, more details. *How* are they close? When do you remember them being there for you?"). His forays into such connections, however, were always limited to one page.

During his mid-term interview, Josh identified this class as the best English course he had ever taken. It was different from former English classes because

> *[In] my previous English classes, just like here's the work, do it and nothing was said how to do it. She goes into more detail how to do things, and it's like I look forward to going to class. I don't dread it . . .*

Josh implied that a student's job is to do "work" for the teacher and that in this classroom the teacher expedited the process by giving "more detail how to do things."

During the interview, Josh also discussed his frustration with the English class of the previous semester. He observed that no matter how much effort he had exerted, his essays were never "better than a C or a D." Josh complained that the teacher would "rip them apart piece by piece, which I didn't understand." When he had asked her how the essays could be improved, she had told him "to change things around, which I would do but it wouldn't make that much of a difference. I'd be passing all essays, but I wasn't getting Bs or As in English, like C was the best I could do." Again, context for Josh was principally understanding what the teacher wanted in written assignments and delivering that. Although Josh had heeded her advice to "change things around," he could never determine what changes were necessary to please her.

In one essay meta-analysis Josh was asked, "What did you like BEST about your essay?" His reply is telling: "The grade I got on it and how everything feel together so clearly." Perhaps Josh believed everything fell together "so clearly" because he had earned an "A" on the paper. Certainly the prominence his answer extends to this teacher-generated value judgement suggests that for Josh, pleasing the teacher was a significant consideration in his meaning-making behaviors.

Making a Personal Connection

Despite differences in individual tasks, all assignments in this response-centered classroom underscored the importance of readers in meaning-making. Students were

encouraged to explore nascent interactions with text in order to tap likely sources of their individual interpretations. But Josh's written work over the semester consistently favored a few properties of text in his interpretive process. In the last weeks of the semester, however, he gradually began drawing on life experience and world view as he made meaning from text.

After reading Owens' World War I poem, "Dulce et Decorum Est," students were asked to write an affective-associative response. Josh began by summoning a familiar form:

> *As I read this poem I felt a sence of fear and helplessness. The sence of fear is created by the soldiers not knowing what going to happening to them, if there going to die . . . They also were helpless to see the soldier who got poisened by the gas and how they could not help him. But only watch him die because he could not get his mask on.*

Typically, Josh had listed two points he would make. Although the question invited a personal connection and response, both points were supported exclusively from textual example. Yet for the first time, Josh used his associative response to make a direct connection between his life experience and events in the text:

> *This poem reminds me of playing soccer in high school by the way the soldiers rushed to put there masks on. These reminds me of soccer practise and using everything you had to beat the other player to the ball, to stop the other other player from scoring, to get a rush out of life. That what reminds me of the gas, in how they rushed to survivie. In the way the soldiers died reminds me of how my grandfather died right in front of me when I was five and how I could do nothing for him but watch and sit and wait for hope as the rescue workers worked on him.*

Besides this heuristic, Josh chose to use the poem as a topic for a pre-writing activity, an in-class essay (with meta-analysis), and a final exam question. For each of those assignments, he referred to events in the poem, and he reiterated the same two personal examples. But there were also moments when he drew on his view of the world to elaborate his statements. In his pre-writing he wrote:

> *My responce tells me that I am a person who thinks that life is unfare at times, but you have have to life your head up and go on, and make the best out of everything in life.*

And in his in-class essay, Josh asserted passionately:

> *I thinck the poem wants you to know why should people have to die in such painful ways. What is so sweet and fitting to die and be flug into a wagon. Theres nothing sweet or fitting about this is there? I think war should be settled in peaceful ways or in less painful methods of warfare. My main interpretation is that war is unfare, and hurts a lot of people and affects the ways that others thinck about certain subjects.*

Josh's "main interpretation" had gone beyond the text here, using the poem's events as a springboard for his own opinion. Meaning-making in this passage had been both reader- and text-based. Even more significant was Josh's identification of the "most important feature" of the poem:

> *The most important feature of this poem would have to be the affect I got from reading it and what I got out of it. What I got out of the poem was a sence of fear and helplessness of being in a war.*

He ended the passage with

> *These are some of the things I got out of the poem as I read it and how I thought about it as I wondered what if it was me out there.*

For the first time in this classroom, Josh had made meaning by integrating his own life experience (his grandfather's death; his soccer playing) and his view of the world (that war is "unfare"; that people are often helpless) with details from the text (words and incidents). Josh had put himself as a reader and meaning-maker center-stage. The "most important feature" of this poem was not to be found in the text, but in the mind and emotions of the student who had read it. It was a significant departure from his typical meaning-making process and perhaps represented some growth in his repertoire of interpretive strategies. In addition, Josh's essay was longer, had perceptibly more "voice" and fewer mechanical errors than any of his other writing over the semester.

Josh himself seemed to be aware of some new empowerment as a learner. On the last day of class students were asked to write another letter discussing whether there had been any changes in their feelings about literature. Josh wrote:

> *In describing my feelings about the study of literature there really have not been any changes beside, I learned how to read poems better and get a better understanding in how to write what I feel about a certain subject. I can write with an open mind and usually do not get writers block. I have also learned that if you want to something all you have to do is put your mind to it.*
>
> *I have learned about myself as a reader is that if the story, book, novel, etc. That if the material that I am reading is dull, I can not get into the reading and it takes longer to get done. I am reading [what] I enjoy I get into it and finish it in a short period of time. I have also learned to control my writing and put deep thoughts into my work.*

Discussion

Josh's literacy behaviors are consistent with research in reading which indicates that at-risk readers share several characteristics: a) a limited understanding of the reading process compounded by a "lack of knowledge of their own reading processes; b) a poor self-image; c) a failure to value reading as a source of information and enjoyment for a variety of reasons; and d) a limited set of strategies for handling reading tasks (Vacca & Padak, 1990).

Moreover, in the five years since this study was completed, I have worked with many elementary-age students who are at-risk readers and writers. I have repeatedly been struck by the similarities between them and Josh. Like Josh, they are heavily dependent on text-based clues when constructing meaning with print. They too are reluctant to intrude extra-textual experience when reading. Often they are limited in their literary schemata, and rely heavily on decoding individual words, hoping that if they get the words "right" the print will automatically make sense. And, like Josh, they look to the teacher for approbation and guidance in all things; because they are unwilling to *take* risks they are frequently *at* risk in most classroom contexts.

Until recently, intervention for such students has chiefly been through dogged re-enforcement of text-based skills, exercises focused on linguistic rules or structural form. Some studies have found that while teachers are reviewing these skills with lower reading groups, they are focusing on comprehension with higher reading groups (Cazden, 1985; McDermott, 1978). Yet we know that fluent readers use both the text and their own interactions with the world to construct meaning (Smith, 1988). If these studies are accurate, then typical reading instruction may be counterproductive for those relegated to low reading groups because it corroborates an already distorted and limited view of reading. This would certainly explain why, despite intensive intervention, most children at risk continue to lose ground year after year. Eventually, they become the "Josh" who sits in our developmental college classrooms. In fact, Josh himself had been in remedial reading classes since his first years in school.

In her 1977 seminal work, *Errors and Expectations,* Shaughnessy observed of basic college writers that typical intervention aimed at increased efficiency in language use invariably resulted in over-attention to form. The result was that students frequently short circuited their own learning processes. Josh's use of text-based information sources, for example, was an appropriate psycholinguistic strategy. But, like Shaughnessy's basic writers, his excessive dependence on this strategy inadvertently obstructed his own meaning-making activity by denying him access to a myriad of information sources, both textual and non-textual.

Moreover, Bloome (1985) observes that "when students are asked to do a similar task lesson after lesson, month after month, grade after grade, they may develop a set way of doing reading" (p. 139). He has further demonstrated that this similarity of reading tasks across grades means the "socialization of a way of reading" in which children learn "culturally bound ways of thinking, (including problem solving, inferencing, and conceptualizing)" (Bloome, 1985, p. 138, 139).

Certainly Josh had internalized the belief that finding and then demonstrating "deep thoughts" was the purpose of reading literature. He had also mastered a set way of demonstrating those thoughts, probably because of the similarity of skills-based reading tasks he had completed year after year. Having made certain assumptions about what teachers of literature wanted, Josh saw context narrowly as meeting those expectations. What he had failed to understand was the breadth and versatility of his own role in that process.

Implications

This study, then, indicates that some adult at-risk readers may be excessively dependent on a linear, skills-based or "bottom up" conceptualization of the reading process. For teachers of underprepared college students, this study further suggests new instructional directions tempered by a heightened awareness of the influence of teacher and context in the growth process.

New Instructional Directions

For Josh, the successful reading of a literary text occurred when he could systematically move through phonemic stages, and extract what he regarded as the text's uncorrupted and "deep" meaning. One legacy of traditional literature instruc-

tion from its New Critical perspective of interpretive "objectivity" has been to favor the text over the reader and cognition over affect. Since most reading instruction for students considered at risk is heavily skills- or text-based, Josh's interpretive paradigm was surely an aggregate of his own classroom experience. But his narrow conceptual view left him little room to navigate his own meaning-making process.

The response approach to literary instruction seems ideally suited to students like Josh because it privileges the reader over the text (Mailloux, 1990). By acknowledging that "human understanding" is rooted in "the individual's knowledge and feelings and characterized by the fundamental act of making meaning," response-based instructional strategies validate the important role of an individual's schemata in the meaning-making process (Petrosky, 1982, p. 26). In addition, an enormous body of recent research in socio- and psycholinguistics has demonstrated that fluent readers naturally construct meaning holistically, drawing on multiple information sources in the process (Smith, 1994; Weaver, 1994). Exploration of those information sources focuses meaning making on both the process and product of literary interpretation.

For most of this semester Josh made only perfunctory personal connections to the texts he read. But in the final weeks, he began to infuse personal experience and feelings into the interpretive process, particularly when writing a response to "Dulce Et Decorum Est." In some ways, the World War I poem about death from gas poisoning triggered old and seemingly unrelated associations: playing soccer and watching his grandfather die. Furthermore, it is impossible to know whether Josh's ability to articulate a personal connection was due to the power of this specific text, the nature of this particular teacher-generated task, or an expanding notion of meaning making. In any case, the connection—however tentative or rudimentary—suggests Josh had come to trust that his personal experience had a legitimate role in the interpretive process. Students like Josh who are overly dependent on text-based information sources may eventually be liberated by a response pedagogy.

One important byproduct of that liberation may be metacognitive growth. As they deliberately draw attention to the self and to the process of knowing, response approaches concurrently foster metacognitive awareness. Baker and Brown (1984) define metacognition as text knowledge, task knowledge and self knowledge. Stadulis and Shearer (1992) believe a critical feature of metacognition is "feelings of self-worth, self-confidence and self-awareness" (p. 6). Furthermore, a growing body of research has positively linked high metacognitive awareness with school success (Paris, Lipson, & Wixon, 1994). In his final letter, Josh's comments suggest growth in all these metacognitive spheres (see p. 21).

Influence of Teacher and Context

For me, the most challenging issue to emerge from this study concerns the organic relationship between teacher and student in a response-centered classroom. Bloome and Green (1984) have observed that in school all reading events are socially constructed:

> . . . both the nature of literacy learning skills (such as learning how to respond to comprehension questions) and opportunities for literacy development (such as gaining access to literacy learning events) are socially

> negotiated . . . what is learned and who learns it is linked to the nature of the classroom context created by teacher-student and student-student interactions (p. 406).

Heap (1986) refers to this "social negotiation" skill as "cultural logic," or "the knowledge and reasoning which allow us to bring to bear the right set of assumptions and expectations . . . for traveling in the province we think we are entering" (p. 76). For the student of literature, this "province" is twofold: a) knowledge of the text, and its organization of linguistic concepts, and b) knowledge of the classroom context, where students operationalize their understanding of text.

Meaning making, then, is an institutionally-bound activity whose process adjusts itself to meet specific contextual goals. For most students, contextual goals are an amalgamation of teacher expectation, past school experience, individual predisposition. But for Josh, contextual goals were solely teacher-driven. Moreover, this limited perception of context was, for him, the progenitor of all meaning-making activity in the academy. Josh typically delivered exactly what I asked for, rarely taking intellectual risks needed to "catch up" with his peers in one semester.

Vygotsky (1962) claims that what children can do today with assistance from a skilled adult they can do independently tomorrow. By offering children tasks that are developmentally appropriate (i.e., within their "zone of proximal development") teachers can support learners. This is the stance I deliberately assumed with Josh, constantly assessing his behaviors and offering him what I believed were developmentally-appropriate tasks. According to Vygotsky's (1962) theory, teachers can also gradually withdraw support as learners gain independence from their increasing expertise. But what happens to older students like Josh for whom—either from longstanding habit or mistaken belief—that independence fails to develop?

Certainly shrewd assessment of teacher expectation is a valuable metacognitive skill, one practiced regularly by proficient learners. Such learners also draw on a repertoire of meaning-making strategies which they activate for distinct purposes and contexts. In the end, Josh's excessive dependence created a disconcerting paradox: without my counsel and modelling, Josh was debilitated as a meaning-maker. With it, he was able to figure out how to succeed in my classroom and, albeit slowly, to grow. Yet if at-risk readers like Josh focus exclusively on the teacher, how will they ever move beyond "*proximal* development"?

In some ways, Josh's teacher dependence is not surprising. Most research, including the results of this study, has long indicated that students believe "it is the teacher who makes the difference in the long run" (Nelson, 1983, p. 13; Dwyer & Dwyer, 1994). Research endemic to literature instruction further corroborates this (Newton, 1995). But the dilemma for teachers of underprepared college students is how to simultaneously nurture and wean our students so that they may develop not only fluent linguistic skills but also the metacognitive awareness and cultural logic so essential to success in a university community.

Conclusion

Despite the thorny issue of teacher stance, Josh's story is ultimately a hopeful one. With a response-based approach, he gradually began to construct meaning holistically. He became more confident as a literacy learner: he believed he could

now share his "feelings" and "put deep thoughts" into his work. And happily, Josh eventually graduated from the university with a business degree in marketing.

Possibly more significant than its pedagogical insights, then, this study suggests that our Joshes can succeed. But we must recognize—and respect—that they may progress very slowly. They need time to be weaned from twelve years of skills-based education. They need opportunities, safe places to take risks without ridicule. When Josh compared death from gas poison to a soccer game he took an incredible chance, one he at last felt comfortable taking.

By honoring these precepts, do we ultimately set underprepared students up for failure with traditional college teachers? Maybe. Perhaps here is where we might begin to integrate teacher, student, and context through the deliberate instruction of cultural logic as a metacognitive skill. With sustained and conscious attention, such logic may enable those at-risk to operate independently in other school contexts. In the end, however, I believe we must simply trust that once our Joshes have found their voices, they will also come to value their own roles in the reading and writing process. And when they do, they will learn to rely on themselves in every classroom.

Appendix A
Sample Journal Writing Assignment

Journal assignment based on Bleich (1978) Affective-Associative Response Heuristic:

IN-CLASS: Read "My Papa's Waltz."

1) Write in journals: "Describe how you felt as you were reading this work." (5 minutes)

2) Write in journals: "What memories or associations did you experience as you read that may have influenced your affective response?" (5 minutes)

3) Write in journals: "Choose what you believe to be the most important word in this piece. Briefly, defend your choice." (5 minutes)

Appendix B
Sample Essay Assignment

Short Story Essay

Relate a situation in your own life to the situation faced by a character in one of the short stories we have read. Compare your behavior in that situation with the behavior of the character. What "epiphany" or "initiation" did you experience? did he/she?

Appendix C
Sample Meta-Analysis Writing Assignments

Metacognitive Activity Following Class Discussion:

In a journal entry, describe one significant difference between your understanding of today's short story and that of your group (or of a point raised in class discussion).

Analyze what about your background, how you approach reading, etc., might have contributed to this difference?

Short Story Essay Meta-Analysis

Write responses to the following questions about the essay you have just completed:

1. How did the idea for this paper come to you?
2. How many different times did you work on it?
3. How difficult was it to write the first draft?
4. Did you write other drafts? If so, what changes did you make?
5. Did you share your essay with anyone else?
6. What do you like *best* about it?
7. What did you like *least?*
8. How might you improve your next writing assignment?

References

Baker L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research Vol. II* (pp. 353-394). New York: Longman.

Bleich, D. (1978). *Subjective criticism.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bloome, D. (1985). Reading as a social process. *Language Arts, 62*(2), 134-142.

Bloome, D., & Green, J. (1984). Directions in the sociolinguistic study of reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 395-421). New York: Longman.

Cazden, B. C. (1985). Social context of learning to read. In H. Singer and R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* 3rd ed. (pp. 722-750). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Cooper, C. R. (1985). Introduction. In C. R. Cooper (Ed.), *Researching response to literature and the teaching of literature: Points of departure* (pp. ix-xix). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Dwyer, E. J., & Dwyer, E. E. (1994). How teacher attitudes influence reading achievement. In E. H. Cramer & M. Castle (Eds.), *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education* (pp. 66-73). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(1), 21-32.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldinede Gruyter.

Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh, & I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and eye* (pp. 331-358). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Green, J. L., & Harker, J. O. (1982). Gaining access to learning: Conversational, social, and cognitive demands of group participation. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom* (pp. 183-221). New York: Academic Press.

Heap, J. L. (1986). Cultural logic and schema theory: A reply to Bereiter. *Curriculum Inquiry, 16*(1), 73-86.

Homer (1946). *The Odyssey* (E. V. Rieu, Trans). London: Penguin Books.

Judy, S. N., & Judy, S. J. (1983). *The English teacher's handbook: Ideas and resources for teaching English.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.

Mailloux, S. (1990). The turns of reader-response criticism. In C. Moran & E. F. Penfield (Eds.), *Conversations: Contemporary critical theory and the teaching of literature* (pp. 38-54). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Martinez, M. G., & Roser, N. L. (1991). Children's responses to literature. In J. Flood,

J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*, (pp. 643-654). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Newton, E. (1992). University students as readers of literature within a response-based composition classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53-08*(A), 2667. (University Microfilms No. AAI9238791).

Newton, E. (1995). College students' perception of effective and ineffective literature instruction. In W. M. Linek and E. G. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Generations of Literacy* (pp. 161-171). Pittsburgh, KS: The College Reading Association.

Paris, S. G., Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1994). Becoming a Strategic Reader. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 788-810). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pearson, P. D., & Tierney, R. J. (1984). On becoming a thoughtful reader: Learning to read like a writer. Offprint from the *Eighty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.* Chicago, IL: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Perl, S. A. (1978). *Five writers writing: Case studies of the composing processes of unskilled college writers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39,* 8A. (University Microfilms International No. 7824104).

Petrosky, A. (1982). From story to essay: Reading and writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33,* 19-36.

Price, M. (1990). *Reader-response criticism: A test of its usefulness in a first year college course in writing about literature.* New York: Peter Lang.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. (1983). *Literature as exploration* (4th ed.) New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Seidel, J. V. (1985). *The ethnograph* [computer program]. Corvallis, OR: Qualis Research Associates.

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1988). A developmental comparison of three theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. *Research in the Teaching of English, 22*(2), 196-212.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, F. (1994). *Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read* (5th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smith, F. (1988). *Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read* (4th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Squire, J. R. (1994). Research in reader response, naturally interdisciplinary. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. & Ruddell, H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 637-652). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stadulis, J. K., & Shearer, D. G. (1992). Person, process, product: Goals of an integrated reading/writing curriculum for underprepared college freshmen. In N. Padak, T. Rasinski & J. Logan (Eds.), *Literacy research and practice: Foundations for the Year 2000.* Fourteenth Yearbook of the College Reading Association.

Tierney, R. J., Soter, A., O'Flahavan, J. F., & McGinley, W. (1989). The effects of reading and writing upon thinking critically. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24*(2), 134-173.

Vacca, R. T., & Padak, N. D. (1990). Who's at risk in reading? *Journal of Reading, 33,* 486-489.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weaver, C. (1994). *Reading process and practice: From socio-psycholinguistics to whole language.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Williams, T. (1947). *A streetcar named Desire.* New York: Signet.

Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books

Marguerite Cogorno Radencich
University of South Florida

This research explores assignation of race/ethnicity to a school principal in each of four chapter books in which his/her race/ethnicity was not depicted by illustration or other means. The books included two female and two male principals. Forty undergraduate students of varied racial/ethnic backgrounds were shown the pictures in each book and then asked to circle one of five race/ethnicities for the principal based on their reading of a comprehensive excerpt and to write an explanation of their choice. Discussion followed. At subsequent sessions, the class was queried on responses in need of clarification, and students wrote comments as to the impact of the study on their thinking.

Factors which emerged as major explanations for readers' opinions were their background experiences; names in the book of principal, school, and students; the principal's deportment, appearance, and language; and book illustrations. The role of race/ethnicity of the reader was a minor one. Findings indicate a tendency for readers, in the absence of any clues otherwise, to picture school principals as Caucasian, basing decisions on their individual processing of text-based information. Implications include a suggestion that preservice teacher educators foster in preservice teachers the experiencing of multiple envisionments, especially as these relate to issues of diversity, both their own reading and that of their students.

Reader Assignation of Race/Ethnicity to Ambiguously Depicted School Principals in Chapter Books

A colleague and I were writing a piece on the roles of principals in children's and young adult literature (Radencich & Harrison, 1997). In an attempt to categorize gender and race/ethnicity of principals, questions arose. What about the picture book principal who appears only through the zzz's under the principal door (Cazet, 1990)? And what about the picture and chapter books when race/ethnicity is unstated? It is often the case in US literature that characters are presumed to be White unless specifically described otherwise (Morrison, 1992). My colleague and I raised questions regarding images formed by child readers when there is ambiguity (Harrison & Radencich, 1996). The present research followed in examining undergraduate students' images regarding race/ethnicity when story characters are in a position of authority, specifically that of a school principal. My question was: *What text- and reader-based factors play roles in principal race/ethnicity assignations?*

From a pedagogical standpoint, I hoped that participation in the research would help students reflect on their images when they read and consider their own biases. I had sometimes noted in my undergraduate students a lack of multicultural appreciation and understanding, perhaps a problem at many institutions. I hypothesized that analysis of students' responses would lead to better understanding of their perspectives in order to serve as a basis for efforts to broaden their views.

Two bodies of research inform this study: reader response and sociolinguistic research on the ethnography of speaking. Reader response theory sees the reader and the text as equal partners in interpretation, with meaning not found exclusively in either the text or the reader (Culler, 1982). A well-established body of research shows the role on interpretation and remembering of text of reader-based factors such as autobiographical experiences (Beach, 1983) and other prior knowledge and cultural background (Anderson & Pichert, 1978; Goetz, Schallert, Reynolds, & Radin, 1983; Pichert & Anderson, 1977; Reynolds, Taylor, Steffensen, Shirey, & Anderson, 1982; Steffensen, Joag-dev, & Anderson, 1979). A readers' choice of interpretation is, to some degree, conscious. Morrison (1992) noted that "each of us reads, becomes engaged in and *watches* what is being read all at the same time" (p. x). And as Rabinowitz (1987) tells us, engagement with a literary text is largely a matter of making choices. The reader must try to ascertain authorial intention while integrating his/her own schemata with the text. Readers move beyond their expectations for a text, filtering them with patterns of defense and adaptation, and then imbuing the text with their own fantasies (Holland, 1985). Readers also move beyond a strong need for character identification to greater recognition of and tolerance for multiple interpersonal perspectives (Beach & Brunetti, 1976; Beach & Hynds, 1991; Jose & Brewer, 1984).

A second research base that informs this study is the work on oral language and the ethnography of speaking by sociolinguists and dialectologists. Dialectologists who study the ethnography of speaking (Sherzer, 1977) examine language use ecologically, in cultural and social contexts. Sherzer sees such study as helping us understand not only overt but also subtle linguistic forms. McDermott (1977) points to the importance of studying the ethnography of speaking in classrooms—and its relationship to learning to read—by asserting that lives are gained and lost depending on whether teachers and students can learn to make sense of each other. Ethnographic and sociolinguistic research informs the present research with regard to attitudes that may influence readers' decisions. People hold consistent attitudes toward one another's speech (Fraser, 1973; Shuy & Williams, 1973). Dialects and sociolects have not only an objective reality in the way people talk, but also a subjective reality for teachers as well as the general public. Teachers and preservice teachers tend to employ stereotyped sets of attitudes as anchor points for their assignation of race/ethnicity to persons based on speech samples (Williams, 1973a). The stereotype may be first elicited by minimal cues, with further evaluations based on differentiations from that stereotype (Williams, 1973b).

The present study builds on the research based on reader response and sociolinguistics by exploring one aspect of the principal image, that of the principals' race/ethnicity. I examined the race/ethnicity assignations given by undergraduate students to ambiguously depicted school principals in chapter books, and the constellation of text- and reader-based factors that influenced these assignations.

Method

Participants

The subject pool began as the 34 students enrolled in my undergraduate level children's literature summer class at the University of South Florida (USF). For

most participants this was the summer before their final year of teacher preparation. The group composition was 10 male and 24 female students and 30 Caucasian, two Hispanic, and two Black students. Approximately one third of the students were adults (>22, Terrell, 1990). Some of the adult students had other college degrees and were enrolled in a program to obtain teaching certification. Four students (all Caucasian males) were business and accounting majors, taking the course as a requirement aimed at broadening perspectives.

At the time of the study, the course was nearing completion, so students had often heard me emphasize the importance of multicultural understanding, and they had had broad exposure to multicultural literature. To improve the ratio of Caucasian to nonmainstream students, I later gathered data from the nonmainstream undergraduate students who had taken courses with me the previous semester. These were two Hispanic, one Hispanic/Asian (Filipino), and three Black students (a total of four females and two males). Thus, the total sample size was 40.

Book Selection

The books used were four intermediate level chapter books in which there was a principal of ambiguous race/ethnicity who was not pictured in book illustrations, but was depicted through description and speech. Excerpts were used, rather than entire texts, to keep the amount of reading manageable. Two selections each had female and male principals. The female principals were Sister Superior in McNeil's (1982) *Miss P. and Me* and Miss Hutter in Gilson's (1982) *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub,* and the male principals were Dr. Vargas in Levy's (1992) *Keep Ms. Sugarman in the Fourth Grade* and Mr. Barnes in Shreve's (1993) *Joshua T. Bates Takes Charge.* At the time the research was planned, I knew of only one additional book that met the criteria for selection, the fifth being another book of Shreve's (1984), *The Flunking of Joshua T. Bates,* in which the principal played a lesser role than in the book of Shreve's that was selected.

Passage Preparation

Excerpts from selected texts were made as short as possible within the criteria of including all mentions of the principal along with summarization of other story events when necessary for overall understanding. The excerpts were typed in two columns to match the appearance of a book, with summarization in italics. The length of passages in pages typical of chapter books was as follows: 6, 3, 3, and 24. The principals' language in each passage was related to communication with students. The amount of principal language in the passages was relatively proportionate to passage length. Following are samples of each principal's language.

> *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub:*
>
> Miss Hutter, the principal, was standing in the hall talking to two teachers. She turned and faced us like a wall. Looking over her red-rimmed half-glasses, she said, "The bell, children, has not rung, and will not ring for a good twelve minutes."
>
> "But our box," Molly said desperately. . . .
>
> Miss Hutter looked us over, took a deep, impatient breath, and said, "I suppose two of you may come in with it. But the rest of you must go to the playground."

Keep Ms. Sugarman in the Fourth Grade

"You all know that we've been without a principal for several months." Ms. Sugarman paused again. So far she hadn't told us anything new.

"Dr. Vargas's doctors have told him that he has to retire early," continued Ms. Sugarman.

I swear she was looking straight at me. "I've been appointed principal," she said softly.

Miss P and Me:

"I am sure," yelled Sister Superior, "you will find this a most rewarding year." She lowered her thick eyebrows. "You *will* welcome her as students of St. Jerome's *always have*." Sister Superior made it sound like a threat, and then she told us all to tuck in our blouses and not look sloppy. . . .

Joshua T. Bates Takes Charge:

"We're not leaving this room until I get an answer," Mr. Barnes warned. "No one knows anything?" he asked, surveying the room. His eyes swept back and forth, until they settled on Joshua T. Bates.

"Joshua," Mr. Barnes said, his voice less angry now than disappointed. "Isn't there something, anything, you'd like to say?"

Miss Hutter is stern throughout most of the book, but softens some at the end. Sister Superior shows only a severe side, and Miss Sugarman only a gentle side. Mr. Barnes shows both excellent ongoing rapport with an individual student and sternness in following steps toward resolving a serious problem.

Procedures for Reading and Responding

The sequence of book presentation was based on several considerations. One was passage length. The longest passage, *Joshua T. Bates Takes Charge,* was left for the end to avoid discouraging any reluctant readers. This final passage was preceded with *Keep Ms. Sugarman in the Fourth Grade,* a book that introduces the Hispanic name of Dr. Vargas. By making this book third, readers who automatically responded with one race/ethnicity in mind might continue through the first two passages undisturbed by a similar jolt to their thinking. This then left as our first and second passages *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub* and *Miss P. and Me,* respectively.

During a class session, I told students that we all form images in our mind as we read. I gave them a form on which they were to anonymously (a) circle for each book one of five descriptors of the principal: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American, and (b) state their reasons for their decision. On the form also was space for recording the reader's own gender and race/ethnicity, as well as the "race/ethnicity of principals when I was in school or who I have met as an adult." Procedures continued as follows. Recognizing the impact of illustrations on children's comprehension and response to text (Joshua-Shearer, 1995; Kiefer, 1982; Sheldon, 1986), I showed students the illustrations of *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub* and gave them the excerpt to read and respond to. I emphasized that the pictures in this and the other books were not illustrations of the principal. I followed a similar procedure, one at a time, for the additional titles. When the class completed the response sheet, I invited them to comment orally on their responses one book at a time. Following my reading of the student response sheets, in two class sessions the

following week, I probed student thinking further, queried students on their survey responses, and then asked students to write me a comment on what they had learned from the process.

Results and Discussion

Results and discussion are organized as follows: general findings, characteristics of readers, text-based factors, reader-based factors, and reflections on the process. The distinction between text- and reader-based factors is, of course, not a clear dichotomy. Rather, the discussion is separated here to reflect apparent primary of one or the other type of factor in any given student decision.

General Findings

Twenty-seven of the 40 students listed at least two race/ethnicities of principals in their childhood and adult experience, with Caucasian being included in all cases. Ten listed only Caucasian principals. Three did not respond. Students had some experience with Black ($N = 22$) and Hispanic ($N = 14$) principals, but little with those who were Asian ($N = 3$) or Native American ($N = 2$).

In their responses, eight students refused to limit themselves to a single category on at least one of their responses, sometimes circling more than one or sometimes circling none. Assignations were tallied if students selected either one or two categories for the book. All but one student used varied assignations across books. White was the most frequent coding for Miss Hutter (80%) and Sister Superior (73%). Hispanic was the most frequent for Dr. Vargas (62%). Mr. Barnes was coded White or Black with equal frequencies. These responses paralleled student experience with principals of different race/ethnicity, (i.e., decreasing frequency from White, to Black and Hispanic, to Native American and Asian).

The passage with Dr. Vargas was problematic. Dr. Vargas was the outgoing principal, but the story focus was on Ms. Sugarman, the incoming principal. This led students to ignore directions to respond to Dr. Vargas. With later questioning, five students admitted coding for Ms. Sugarman, who is pictured as Black, rather than Dr. Vargas.

Four readers left all or most of the rationale sections blank. A few explanations cited two or more factors in decision-making, with these spread out over 18 of the students. Most explanations, however, listed a single factor, with the factor listed generally differing across titles.

Characteristics of Readers

Children's cultural attitudes are formed early and are reinforced by years of living within one's own cultural group (Harris, 1993; Laframboise & Griffith, 1996; Milner, 1983). Delpit (1995) reminds us that "we all interpret behaviors, information, and situations through our own cultural lenses; these lenses operate involuntarily, below the level of conscious awareness, making it seem that our own view is simply 'the way it is' " (p. 151). In analyzing responses vis a vis race/ethnicity of the reader, there is the danger of seeing each race/ethnicity as a separate and defined voice, an assumption which would be incorrect, and especially so given the interactions and

mobility in our complex world. Research in the 1970s showed us this complexity. For example, on the one hand, Williams (1973a) found that Black and Caucasian teachers differed in their stereotypes. Yet Shuy (1977) found that both Black and Caucasian listeners agree when designating the race of Caucasians and Blacks. In Shuy's research, speakers of different socioeconomic status were identified quite accurately by both groups except in the case of upper middle class Black speakers, who were judged as Caucasian by 90% of the listeners, regardless of the listener's race, age, or gender. The lower the class of the speaker, the more accurately he/she was identified by listeners.

In the present research, it appears that personal race/ethnicity of the reader played a very minimal role in assignations of principals. Miss Hutter was labeled White by 80% of the entire sample and 90% of the ten non-Caucasian students. The parallel figures for Sister Superior were 75% and 80%, and for Mr. Barnes, 50% and 50%. I was interested in knowing whether the 50% White/Black ratio for Mr. Barnes might differ for the five Black students, but it did not. The data on Dr. Vargas, as noted earlier, are unclear. However, the majority of Caucasian, Black, and Hispanic students did label him as Hispanic.

Despite the lack of a clear relationship between the reader's race/ethnicity and the assignation, some student responses did, as expected, show a mindset of viewing the principal through students' own lenses. One Caucasian male student, who listed five race/ethnicities of principals in his experience, nonetheless used the term "we" in all responses. He seemed to assume that his lens, perhaps colored largely with his own race/ethnicity, was the same as that of other readers. He noted for Miss Hutter, "When we think of a typical principal, we think of white" and for Miss P. he said, "When we think of Catholic, we think of white Anglo Saxon." For Dr. Vargas he noted, "We think of a doctor as being white." And for Mr. Barnes, discounting the illustrations of primarily Caucasian children, he said, "This is a school with the beginnings of gang violence. This could be a ghetto school, so we think of the principal as being black."

Anglo-centric responses were not, however, the norm. Most students in this study may well have moved, as Beach and Hynds (1991) suggest, from a strong need for character identification to greater recognition of and tolerance for multiple interpersonal perspectives.

Text-Based Factors

The text-based factors analyzed here are: (a) name of principal/school/students, (b) principal's deportment and appearance, (c) principal's language and speech patterns, and (d) illustrations.

Name of principal/school/students. The names of principal, school, and students sometimes influenced decision-making. One student mentioned names as rationales for her assignations of all four principals. The effect of a name is most apparent with Dr. Vargas. Those who focused on Dr. Vargas rather than Miss Silverman as the principal in this book overwhelmingly saw him as Hispanic. Interestingly, eight students (25% of the sample), saw him as Anglo, with one of these students explaining that the "Dr." led her to an Anglo designation. Names played a role in the other books as well.

Four students thought the name Miss Hutter sounded White. For two students who saw Mr. Barnes as White, comments were, "name sounds characteristic of White" and "names of boys." For Sister Superior, one student wrote: "I guess I am assuming she is Black because of the name of the school [St. Jerome's]." Children's names also played a role in assignations in this book. The student who had equated all-American with White saw Sister Superior as White: "Just because of the names. Janie and Mary Anne seem so wholesome and almost southern."

The use of names in assignation of race/ethnicity is a logical cue for readers. Two students in the present study point out, however, that names can sometimes be misleading.

Principal's deportment and appearance. Some of the comments I found most revealing related to a principal's deportment and appearance. Stereotypes find fertile soil here. Strictness is a dominating trait of Miss Hutter's, and I found it interesting to see how this trait led students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds to their decisions. One Black student wrote:

> I felt principal was White because everyone seemed to fear her. I feel that in the situation like those experienced in the story, people from minority groups are a little more approachable and a little less intimidating. I felt that a minority principal would welcome a presentation about another minority group.

One Caucasian student saw her "down to business attitude" as an indication that she might be Black. On the other hand, a Black student wrote, "She just seemed to be a White principal, attitude-wise." A Hispanic student wrote, "Her stern attitude. She had little knowledge of other cultures." Miss Hutter's attire was a factor in at least one assignation. A Caucasian student wrote, "the way she was dressed reminded me of a classy White woman."

Mr. Barnes's sternness, as was the case for Miss Hutter, led to interesting Black/White comparisons. One Black student wrote, "I just pictured myself there with my principal awhile ago, and he was firm with me like Mr. Barnes was with Joshua." One Hispanic student who labeled him as Black wrote, "There is no particular reason for my choice other than how sweet, gentle, and fair Mr. Barnes was. I felt like he's experienced cruelty in his life and wanted to make a difference." A Caucasian student who also saw him as Black said, "seemed to have a comforting but stern way—pictured him big." Other attributes led to an assignation of Black or Hispanic by one Caucasian student who explained, "this race is a highly active and enthusiastic people."

Sister Superior's thick eyebrows resulted in her being classified by two students as Black and Hispanic respectively. The former added to this rationale, "strong woman, Catholic church, superior yelling, dictator." For another student, her authoritative manner made her seem White.

Principals' behavior and appearance are bound to impact readers' images. In particular, behavior relating to strictness seemed to help readers form images, albeit very different ones.

Principal's language. Language emerged as a rationale for White assignations for Miss Hutter, Sister Superior, and Mr. Barnes. For Miss Hutter, responses included,

"I decided she must be White based on the dialogue." A similar response for Sister Superior was, "because of the way she spoke," and two parallel responses for Mr. Barnes were, "speech pattern" and "comments reflect traditional, conservative Anglo viewpoints." Were responses about language a matter of associating standard American English with Whites? Or is there something less tangible that distinguishes the language of educated professionals of different racial/ethnic groups? Shuy (1967) notes that comparisons of dialects of well-educated speakers of different areas show more variety in pronunciation than in grammar. He points out, however, that authors' most versatile tool for showing differences is vocabulary choice. Through vocabulary authors can show differences based not only on factors such as age, sex, education, occupation, and origins, but also on social class, personal involvement in the discourse, politeness, and specific context of the discourse (Silva & Zwicky, 1975). In the texts used in this study, there are no pronunciation cues in the text, and the syntax for all principals reflects standard American English, but we can analyze subtle linguistic forms (Sherzer, 1977) through an ethnography of speaking. Such language study is, of course, immensely complicated (Shuy, 1967).

Book illustrations. Joshua-Shearer (1995) notes that words are filtered through mental images and that, conversely, the meaning of pictures is framed and embedded in language. One student noted the illustrations of the characters in *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub* as influential in a decision to label Miss Hutter as White. Four students noted the cover of *Keep Ms. Sugarman in Fourth Grade* in their explanation of why the principal was Black. Two mentioned the cover of *Joshua T. Bates Takes Charge* as influential in their seeing Mr. Barnes as White.

Had the books selected included illustrations of the principals, the role of illustration in assignations would, of course, have been stronger. The race/ethnicity of other characters in the books may have been of limited influence because students may themselves experience practices in which principals serve schools of racial/ethnic backgrounds other than their own.

Reader-Based Factors

Students' life experiences interacted with the text-based factors discussed above and played a role in the assignations of all four principals. Overwhelmingly, in students' experience, Catholic nuns such as Sister Superior are usually White—for one student, "elderly White"—or occasionally Hispanic. Two students saw her as White because of the school's being a private one. For Miss Hutter, one student found the school's rural background to be one factor leading to her being categorized as White.

In the long excerpt from Shreve's *Joshua T. Bates Takes Charge,* readers are given much more detail about Mr. Barnes as a person than is the case in the other three books. The picture of Mr. Barnes is broadened as we are told of the items on his desk, among them a student-made statue of a dog and a picture of himself on a sailboat. These details tended to result in students seeing him as White. One Caucasian student, equating all-American with White, said, "the picture in my mind from having BBQ's helping out, the picture of the dog on the desk. Seems like the all-American man." A Hispanic student's rationale for labeling Mr. Barnes White

was, "He was young and actively involved with the students. He had a picture with his sailboat and family."

As might be expected with any reading, identification was sometimes made with a person known personally or through the media. Interestingly, no students related the characters to others they knew through their reading. Two Caucasian students saw in Miss Hutter's red-rimmed glasses a picture of Sally Jesse Raphael (White). A Black student used her general background experience to comment that "I've only seen White people wear that kind of glasses." Sister Superior took another student back to *The Sound of Music* (White). Yet another pointed out that on TV, nuns were usually White.

Several students for whom Mr. Barnes was Black saw him as a reminder of someone they knew. One student wrote,"It reminded me of Lou Gossett, Jr., when he played the part of a principal in a movie. He was very assertive and stuck up for minorities, and that's what Mr. Barnes did." Two other students knew a Black Mr. Barnes. Others who saw him as Black wrote, "reminds me of my high school principal" and "reminded me of an assistant principal in high school. He always got to the bottom of things."

Reader background, then, played a significant role in readers' images of principals. While decisions were forced, rationales still point to a need for discussions to broaden individuals' experiential bases and encourage students to consider alternative interpretations (Langer, 1990).

Reflections on the Process

Some student responses simply cried out for probes into student thinking. Perhaps most revealing of all was one which said, "I probably saw the principal as White because there are no descriptors of the person's culture or looks." This assumption reflects the preponderance of White characters in the literature which the students know from their childhood and in the literature which they continue to read (Radencich, Barksdale-Ladd, & Draper, 1998). In the present study, 14 students admitted to assuming the character was White if there was no specific descriptor leading them to think otherwise. One Black student explained his labeling of Miss Hutter as White by saying, "Most books state something that implies if a person is of a specific race." He apparently did not see White as a specific race. Two other responses that I probed with the class were "no idea, regular principal to me" and "I would not have thought of any particular race until asked." Another student wrote for the final book, "I was beginning to feel guilty for always picturing the principal as White, so I made this one Black in my mind!"

When the students were queried about any personal learning from having participated in this research, comments were positive. One related to authors' development of characters: "The process made me realize that thought does go into the creation of a character." Others addressed the issue of race. One Black student whose body language had indicated discomfort with the process and who had indicated lack of understanding for the purpose of the activity, when I had later talked to her—wrote, "This activity did not have a major impact. I do not colorize people when reading." The second Black student in the class wrote, "I never really paid attention to the principal, if the book did not indicate through pictures. But *I*

will now pay attention. It did have an effect on me." She was the only student to underline or otherwise emphasize a response.

Some students responded by wearing teacher as well as personal hats. One Caucasian student wrote:

> I feel that I am more conscious of my tendency to mentally picture characters as White when the race is not indicated. As an example, when I was making visual aids to accompany a story, I thought, why don't I make the people in the illustrations African American, Hispanic American, or Asian American?

Another Caucasian student developed some personal commandments, "I will filter my thoughts for bias. I will filter my words for completeness. I will look for ways to share all cultures in my class's reading and listening."

A broadening of these future teachers' views of multiculturalism must perhaps start with such self-analysis. Banks (1991) warns us of the difficulty inherent in changing attitudes with regard to race. One can only hope that the lessons on perspective-taking inherent in this exercise and the reflective responses given by a few students may evidence movement to the third or fourth levels of Banks' (1989) curriculum for integrating multicultural literature in their classrooms. The third level is a transformation approach in which they—and their students—will view issues from more than one perspective, and the final level is a decision-making and social action approach in which they and their students take actions to resolve problems they have identified.

Conclusions

Morrison (1992) explains the process by which the American as "new, white, and male" (p. 43) was constituted—a process in which American was backgrounded by savagery. Morrison sees the four concerns that underlie this process—autonomy, authority, newness and difference, absolute power—as the major themes and presumptions of American literature. She goes on to note that, regardless of the author's race, it was the author's expectation that the readership would be White.

Consistent with this "literary whiteness," readers of diverse race/ethnicity in the current study largely saw principals in their readings as White. Images formed were influenced by both text- and reader-based factors. The factor that appeared to affect assignations the most was reader experiences with persons of a given race/ethnicity. The factor of personal race/ethnicity seemed to play a lesser role. Readers saw principals as White regardless of their experiences with principals of different race/ethnicity, a finding which might have been expected given the preponderance of Anglo-American principals in the United States (Radencich & Harrison, 1997) and in the schools surrounding the university.

Limitations

The results of this research may have differed had students read these or other books in their entirety, had the presentation sequence of selections been counterbalanced, had the student sample represented a different racial/ethnic mix, or had response procedures differed. Wolfram (1973) noted that authentic subjective reac-

tions to speech may be more likely when they appear as indirect and open-ended comments rather than forced choices with respect to predetermined categories of reaction. I did informally address the issue of the forced choices by asking a subsequent children's literature class to read two of the passages, *Thirteen Ways to Sink a Sub* and *Miss P and Me,* and to orally comment on their images. The majority of the students saw the principals as White.

The context of the study was another limiting factor, with the researcher being the course instructor who would assign course grades. Given that my interest in multiculturalism had been made clear, the number of Caucasian assignations may well have been an underestimate of those that might have otherwise occurred, with students perhaps perceiving a political incorrectness of labeling all principals as White. The student who promised to "filter my thoughts for bias" and the one who noted feeling "guilty" about choosing White for all the principals may not have been alone in their self-consciousness during the process.

Results may have also differed if students were reading the books in the comfort of their homes. We know from Beach and Hynds (1991) that the degree to which readers are likely to bring social cognitive processes to their reading is influenced by the academic and social contexts in which the reading occurs.

All suggested alternate procedures point to avenues for further research. Of particular interest might be studies in which students read entire books, forming impressions as they read. Any further research might also benefit from hindsight. In gathering survey data, I wish I had numbered lines on the excerpts and asked students to identify parts of the excerpts which led to given interpretations. I might then have had a better understanding of the source of stereotypical comments like "this race is a highly active and enthusiastic people."

Implications

Steig (1989, p. xvi) states that:

> Communication and discussion of individual affect and associations can lead to new literary understanding, and as well in some cases to new understanding of oneself and of others. . . . Literature can be subversive of fixed, "normal" modes of thinking, and it is the teacher's and critic's function, if not to stress this quality directly, then to help make what seems familiar unfamiliar by showing it from new points of view.

Teachers do much in literary conversations to foster such new understandings by eliciting readers' envisionments and opening the door to other possibilities. From undergraduate education to elementary and secondary classrooms, discussions of assignations of race/ethnicity and other characteristics to ambiguous literary characters can add another vital dimension to such exploration. Readers can, in their imaging, go beyond what Morrison (1992) refers to as the " 'normal,' unracialized, illusory white world" (p. 16) in which silence has historically ruled literary discourse in matters of race as they examine their own cultural values and expectations and construct their knowledge and integrate it with new understandings of their values and attitudes (Byrne, 1992; Tiedt & Tiedt, 1990).

It seems incumbent on educators to problematize both lack of image formation and automatic image formation. Why does an image include no race? Morrison

notes that "the world does not become raceless or will not become unracialized by assertion. The act of enforcing racelessness in literary discourse is itself a racial act" (p. 46). Why is a principal who plays sports and has a family picture on his desk "all-American"? Teacher educators who discuss such issues can foster an openness to multiple possibilities in image formation during personal reading and while facilitating the reading of children. Teacher educators can nudge their charges beyond single rationales explaining their image formation, stretching them to think of the interplay of multiple factors on their unique envisionments. Similar thinking should take place also on the part of classroom authors and commercial authors of children's literature who influence their readers' image formation through their characterizations via the speech, thoughts, and actions of their characters. Such influence may often be unconscious, but is not always so. Morrison, for example, notes that her short story "Recitatif" was an "experiment in the removal of all racial codes from a narrative about two characters of different races for whom racial identity is critical" (p. xi).

Rosenblatt (1983) tells us that "reading consists of a continuous stream of choices on the reader's part" (p. 124). Let us open all readers to the window that displays this kaleidoscopic array.

References

Anderson, R. C., & Pichert, J. W. (1978). Recall of previously information following a shift in perspective. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 17,* 1-12.

Banks, J. A. (1989). Integrating the curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 189-207). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1991). Multicultural education: Its effects on students' racial and gender role attitudes. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 470-480). New York: Macmillan.

Beach, R. (1983). Attitudes, social conventions, and response to literature. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16,* 47-54.

Beach, R., & Brunetti, G. (1976). Differences between high school and university students in their conceptions of literary characters. *Research in the Teaching of English, 10,* 259-268.

Beach, R., & Hynds, R. (1991). Research on response to literature. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, vol. II* (pp. 453-489). Caucasian Plains, NY: Longman.

Byrne, D. A. (1992). Address race, ethnicity, and culture in the classroom. In D. A. Byrnes & G. Kiger (Eds.), *Common bonds: Anti-bias teaching in a diverse society* (pp. 11-22). Wheaton, MD: Association for Childhood Education International.

Cazet, D. (1990). *Never spit on your shoes.* New York: Orchard.

Culler, J. (1982). *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The right to learn and the advancement of teaching: Research, policy, and practice for democratic education. *Educational Researcher, 25*(6), 5-17.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Fraser, B. (1973). Some 'unexpected' reactions to various American-English dialects. In R. W. Shuy & R. W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 28-35). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Gilson, J. (1982). *Thirteen ways to sink a sub.* New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard.

Goetz, E. T., Schallert, D. L., Reynolds, R. E., & Radin, D. I. (1983). Reading in perspec-

tive: What real cops and pretend burglars look for in a story. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75,* 500-510.

Greene, B. (1975). *Philip Hall likes me. I reckon maybe.* New York: Dell.

Harris, V. (1992). *Teaching multicultural literature in grades k-9.* Norwood, CA: Christopher-Gordon.

Harrison, M., & Radencich, M. C. (1996). [Images in children's literature: A study of children's perceptions of race/ethnicity]. Unpublished raw data.

Holland, N. N. (1985). Reading readers reading. In C. R. Cooper (Ed.), *Researching response to literature and the teaching of literature: Points of departure* (pp. 3-21). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Jose, P., & Brewer, S. (1984). Development of story liking: Character identification, suspense, and outcome resolution. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 911-924.

Joshua-Shearer, M. (1995). Imagery: Picture books, ethnicity, gender identification, and literacy: A critical exploration. In M. A. Ice & M. A. Saunders-Lucas (Eds.), *Reading: The blending of theory and practice* (Vol. 3, pp. 17-25). Bakersfield: California State University.

Kiefer, B. (1982). *Response of primary children to picture books.* Unpublished dissertation, Ohio State University.

Laframboise, K. L., & Griffith, P. L. (1996). Using literature cases to examine diversity issues with preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

Langer, J. A. (1990). Understanding literature. *Language Arts, 67,* 812-816.

Levy, E. (1992). *Keep Ms. Sugarman in the fourth grade.* New York: HarperCollins.

McDermott, R. P. (1977). The ethnography of speaking and reading. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Linguistic theory: What can it say about reading?* (pp. 153-185). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

McNeil, F. (1982). *Miss P. and me.* New York: Harper & Row.

Milner, D. (1983). *Children and race.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pichert, J. W., & Anderson, R. C. (1977). Taking different perspectives on a story. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69,* 309-315.

Rabinowitz, P. J. (1987). *Before reading: Narrative conventions and the politics of interpretation.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Radencich, M. C., Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Draper, M. (1998). *Multicultural Self-Selected Reading by Preservice Elementary Education Teachers.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Radencich, M. C., & Harrison, M. (1997). Images of principals in contemporary children's and young adult literature. *The New Advocate, 10,* 335-348.

Reynolds, R. E., Taylor, M. A., Steffensen, M. S., Shirey, L. L., & Anderson, R. C. (1982). Cultural schemata and reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 17,* 353-366.

Rosenblatt, L. (1983). The reading transaction: What for? In R. Parker & F. Davis, (Eds.), *Developing literacy* (pp. 118-135). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Sheldon, A. (1986). The influence of illustration on fifth graders' response to the illustrated poem. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47,* 07A. (University Microfilms No. 86-25, 289).

Sherzer, J. (1977). The ethnography of speaking. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Linguistic theory: What can it say about reading?* (pp. 144-152). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Shreve, S. (1984). *The flunking of Joshua T. Bates.* New York: Knopf.

Shreve, S. (1993). *Joshua T. Bates takes charge.* New York: Knopf.

Shuy, R. W. (1967). *Discovering American Dialects.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Shuy, R. (1977). Sociolinguistics. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Linguistic theory: What can it say about reading?* (pp. 80-94). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Shuy, R., & Williams, F. (1973). Stereotyped attitudes of selected English dialect communities. In R. W. Shuy & R. W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 85-96). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Silva, C. M., & Zwicky, A. M. (1975). Discord. In R. W. Fasold & R. W. Shuy (Eds.). *Analyzing variation in language* (pp. 203-219). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Steffensen, M. S., Joag-dev, C., & Anderson, R. C. (1979). A cross-cultural perspective on reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 15,* 10-29.

Steig, M. (1989). *Stories of reading—Subjectivity and literary understanding.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Terrell, P. S. (1990). Adapting institutions of higher ed to serve adult students' needs. *NASPA Journal, 27,* 241-247.

Tiedt, P. L., & Tiedt, I. M. (1990). *Multicultural teaching: A handbook of activities, information, and resources* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Williams, F. (1973a). Some research and notes on dialect attitudes and stereotypes. In R. W. Shuy & R. W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 113-128). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Williams, F. (1973b). Some research studies of language attitudes. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Some new directions in linguistics* (pp. 121-149). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Wolfram, W. (1973). Objective and subjective parameters of language assimilation among second-generation Puerto Ricans in East Harlem. In R. W. Shuy & R. W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 148-173). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Whole Language: A Survey of a College Population

Latty L. Goodwin
Rochester Institute of Technology

Whole language is a philosophy of teaching that can be effective even at the college level. A study was conducted to determine the level of reading behavior and attitude changes that take place in developmental college students who complete a course which teaches reading and writing in an integrated, whole language approach. A total of 92 college undergraduates enrolled in a developmental communications course were surveyed both before beginning the course and after completion of the course. These students showed significant changes between pretreatment and post-treatment in terms of improved reading behaviors and attitudes.

Whole language instruction has been, and continues to be, hotly debated on the primary and secondary educational fronts. The benefits of this integrated language philosophy have been contrasted with phonics and isolated skill instructional approaches. The numerous books and articles (see Levine, 1994 and Weaver, 1990 for extensive reading lists) have therefore focused attention on the effects of both approaches in primary and secondary language programs. However, the effects of whole language instruction at the college level have not been well explored.

Defining whole language is controversial. Kenneth Goodman (1986), often called the "father" of whole language, has written that language is best learned and easiest to internalize when it is whole and in a natural context. However, that alone is too limited a definition for Goodman. He views whole language as a philosophy of education which is inclusive and compatible with a variety of teaching models. In fact, when teachers truly ascribe to this philosophy, the entire approach to education in any area is affected. These teachers strive to construct collaborative, democratic learning communities which incorporate all content areas.

Weaver (1990) expands upon Goodman's definition and reinforces the fact that whole language is not an approach, as contrasted to phonics-based instruction. She perceives this philosophy to be evolving with the constant input from research and teaching practices. Most whole language proponents would agree that there is no packaged, pre-programmed mode of instruction that *is* whole language. And therein according to Weaver, lies the crux of the controversy. Her question is, "How, then do we characterize both the unity and the diversity—or rather, the unity within the diversity?" (p. 4). These descriptions by two of the major whole language researchers, reflect the abstract nature of whole language as it is presented in studies today. The ambiguity of the philosophy allows for a variety of implementations, any and all of which may be described as whole language.

Some significant pieces of literature help define this ambiguous instructional approach and examine its benefits. Willinsky (1990) begins with a definition of

literacy and proceeds to examine the whole language approach under the umbrella term of "new literacy." He explores the integrated writing and reading programs that have developed over the past decade and promotes more holistic instruction at all grade levels.

Harste (1994) delves into the theory and curriculum of whole language. In this comprehensive look at instructional models, he also examines literacy research perspectives. Harste's emphasis is on the collaborative research model which brings the learner into the world of research and neatly parallels some of the tenets of whole language instruction, such as teacher/learner collaboration and focusing on topics of immediate concern and interest for both the teacher and the learner.

Because so much of the controversy surrounding whole language has placed it in opposition to phonics and skill-based instruction, the vast majority of the articles written about whole language limit the concerns with this type of instruction to only elementary and secondary school students. In addition, there is a lack of research-based information about the effects of this curricular option.

However, some of the work done at the secondary level of schooling can be instructive for research within the college framework. Application of the whole language model in secondary schools can be a challenging process for teachers trying to make a transition from more traditional modes of instruction. Hobson and Shuman (1990), Ross (1991), Sinatra (1991), and Whitt (1994) examine pedagogical issues and attempt to demystify the procedure for adopting whole language instruction in secondary schools. There is agreement that the intimidation and discouragement that many teachers face when attempting this shift is more than compensated for by the increased enthusiasm the students demonstrate in their learning. Students are stimulated because instruction begins with content that interests them and is meaningful for them. While these are valuable discussions for the academic community, none of these writers attempted to research the effects of this curricular change.

There is a small, but growing body of information about whole language instruction at the college level. Zaritsky (1993) provides a succinct definition of whole language at the college level. She found ". . . that our students begin to view reading as a process that can greatly enhance, enrich and empower their lives in a substantive way . . ." (p. 51) when the whole language philosophy is combined with reader response theory. Both focus on the reader, not just the text, and what makes reading meaningful and enjoyable. This is a useful background piece, complementary to the articles concerning secondary schools. Like them, it is not based on original research.

Other similar instructional approaches at the college level claim to have also reaped positive results. Rupert and Brueggeman (1986) applied a whole language philosophy which emphasized reading to write and communicate to their college reading program. A collaborative social approach to reading in which students made choices about their learning was found to be beneficial for the students and the teachers. Kanel and Anthony (1994) made communication the focus of their Communication Arts class. Their students reported that their love for reading and writing had been revived. In addition, within classes labeled "remedial" at the college level,

whole language approaches have proved motivational and productive in improving students' reading skills (Horn, 1992).

One of the few research studies at the college level focusing on whole language pedagogy, discovered an interesting application in a chemistry class (Purcell, 1990). During an ethnographic study, the researcher realized the importance of applying reading, writing, and speaking skills holistically in order to enhance the learning of principles, laws and concepts even in science classes, a finding that Goodman would applaud wholeheartedly.

These findings and observations at the college level indicate that it appears to matter little *how* instructors are applying the whole language philosophy in their classrooms. The important message is that those who are using whole language forms of instruction are realizing great benefits and results. Therefore, there is some theoretical and empirical evidence that suggests that whole language instruction may be effective even at the college level.

In this study, the effects on the reading behaviors and attitudes of college students enrolled in a "communications" course that was taught from a whole language perspective were measured. It was hypothesized that after nine weeks of whole language instruction, the students would demonstrate measurable improvement in their reading behaviors and attitudes. For the purpose of this study, whole language is defined as a philosophy of language instruction which integrates all aspects of language—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—into a unified and purposeful whole.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 145 college undergraduates who were enrolled in a developmental language arts course, entitled "Communications," at a four-year institution in upper New York state during the academic years between 1995 and 1997. All of these students chose to enroll in this course after being placed on academic suspension from their major area of study. Ninety two of these students completed the communications course and both the pretreatment and posttreatment measures, and thus became the research cohort.

Slightly more than three-quarters of the participants were male (n = 74). Of the 92 students, 64% were Anglo (n = 59), 18% were African-American (n = 17), 6% were Latino/a (n = 6), and 11% were Asian (n = 10). The majority of the students were "traditional" college ages (18 to 22 years old), but a few participants were older.

Intervention

The students in the communications course met three times a week for an integrated language arts instruction that combined reading, writing, speaking and listening. The class periods lasted 50 minutes and the course ran for nine weeks. There were two writing instructors and one reading instructor for these classes. The two writing instructors teamed with the reading instructor in order for each class to have

a reading and a writing instructor. All three were well versed in the philosophy of whole language and were enthusiastic about this type of instruction.

On the first day of class, the students completed a 40 question inventory of their reading and writing behaviors and attitudes (Appendix A). It was considered a pretreatment measurement. It was not used as a diagnostic tool to place students or prescribe instruction.

The communications course was developed around the philosophy of whole language instruction. It was felt that a unified language approach would allow adequate instruction time in class and encourage independent, out-of-class work for the students. The students were assigned to one of two sections of the course depending on their class schedules, but not based on diagnostic assessment of their skills. These were heterogeneous groupings in terms of ability levels.

The course was team taught by a writing instructor and the reading instructor. The focus was on the process of communication. The class first selected a common broad topic of focus that each student then narrowed down into a particular area of interest. The instructors guided the selection of the broad topic into either the government's role in society or social issues. The students then found articles about their chosen topics which were read, textmarked and outlined. From the outline, a rough draft was developed following the format that was developed in class brainstorming sessions for the particular style of writing that was being learned. Peer and instructor review of the rough draft assisted the student in revising and developing a final copy of quality. Each student provided the class with an oral update that explained what had been learned about the topic and the process of research.

There were three different writing projects during the course—summary, critique, and persuasion. Each writing project was graded holistically, taking into consideration the entire process, including the oral portion. In addition, toward the end, the students divided themselves into two groups and prepared a panel presentation about the general topic and their particular pieces of the topic. Each panel was given one class period for its presentation. The students were involved in critiquing the presentations and determining the grades.

In addition to the reading and writing projects, the students worked individually on grammar topics and turned in weekly Text Checks (Appendix B) which demonstrated their application of reading strategies to content course textbooks. The final grade for the course was derived from the grades for the three writing projects (which formed the bulk of the grade), the grade for the final presentation, and credit for completing grammar topics and Text Checks. The students provided a self-evaluation and the pair of instructors prepared the final grades together, reviewing the portfolios of completed activities that the students assembled.

The 40 question inventory was re-administered on the last day of instruction as a posttreatment measurement. It was carefully explained at both sessions that these inventories were part of a research project and would not be used in any way to determine student grades or placement.

Data Analysis

The pretreatment and posttreatment questionnaire consists of 40 questions about reading and writing behaviors and attitudes, as well as a few general study ques-

tions. On this inventory, only 16 items pertain strictly to reading behaviors and attitudes and they are, therefore, the only items measured in this study. The other questions refer to writing and study behaviors and attitudes.

Of the 16 reading items, 12 measure reading behaviors and four measure reading attitudes. For the most part, the behaviors involve the conscious application of reading strategies to the students' textbooks. The reading attitudes are the students' personal feelings toward reading.

Each of the responses to these 16 questions are measured on a Likert scale of five choices which range from ALWAYS-A (5), USUALLY-U (4), SOMETIMES-S (3), RARELY-R (2), to NEVER-N (1). The statements are all phrased in a positive frame which means that a sign of improved behavior or attitude is a shift of at least one Likert measurement to the *left*. Each increment of score from one number to the next, is considered to be of equal value. For example, if, on the pretreatment, a student responded with SOMETIMES-S (3) to the statement, "I preview course readings." and on the posttreatment circles USUALLY-U (4), this is interpreted as an improvement in behavior. The scores for each behavior and attitude statement are the dependent variables. The whole language instruction is the independent variable. The pretreatment scores and the posttreatment scores for each dependent variable are compared to assess any changes in reading behaviors and attitudes that might have occurred due to the instruction of the course.

Results

Because this was a before-after research design that paired each student's scores, dependent-samples t-tests were used to assess the significance of the difference between the pretreatment and posttreatment reading behaviors and the pretreatment and posttreatment attitudes (Harris, 1995, p. 271). Table 1 presents the questions and the results of the t-tests for the reading behaviors. Table 2 displays the questions and results of the t-tests for reading attitudes.

The fact that most of the behaviors and attitudes demonstrate significant difference at the highly sensitive alpha level of .001, suggests that this form of instruction was effective in developing changes in the students in these reading areas. Even though there were more behavioral questions than attitudinal questions, the preponderance of behavior changes at the .0000 level and the smaller percentage of this level of significance for the changes in attitude, suggests that this instruction was more effective in changing actual reading behaviors than attitudes.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if college students would show an improvement in reading attitudes and behaviors after completion of a course that integrated reading and writing through whole language instruction. Several studies have examined the effect on reading and writing attitudes and behaviors with whole language instruction (Hobson & Shuman, 1990; Ross, 1991; Sinatra, 1991; and Whitt, 1994), but have been confined to secondary school students. Very little work has been done on the effect of whole language instruction at the college level. The findings of this study indicate that an integrated course of study can have a significant positive effect on students' reading behaviors and attitudes.

Table 1 *Analysis of Reading Behaviors*

Questions

1. I preview course readings.
3. I textmark course readings.
5. I use a system to learn new terms from my course readings.
7. I take notes from my course readings.
9. I develop visuals from my course readings.
11. I don't procrastinate when reading a textbook.
13. I spend time reviewing for tests/exams.
15. I use text parts to aid my reading (index, glossary, headings, etc.).
17. I summarize readings for courses.
21. I use the processes a student must go through in order to be a good writer/reader.
25. I read often.
35. I think about and question what I read.

Question #	Pre-average	Post-average	T(z)	Probability
1	2.780	3.681	6.96	.0000
3	2.578	3.804	9.36	.0000
5	2.578	3.50	6.31	.0000
7	3.10	3.935	5.81	.0000
9	3.05	3.380	2.24	.026
11	2.696	3.10	2.76	.0063
13	3.815	4.385	4.46	.0000
15	3.29	4.033	5.25	.0000
17	2.663	3.457	5.82	.0000
21	2.798	3.659	7.13	.0000
25	3.41	3.870	2.93	.0038
35	3.576	4.033	3.86	.0002

In terms of specific reading behaviors, after instruction, the students reported that they were more likely to *usually* engage in the following reading behaviors: previewing, textmarking, notetaking, reviewing, utilizing text parts, employing reading processes, thinking about and questioning what's read, as well as reading frequently (questions 1, 3, 7, 13, 15, 21, 25 and 35). In addition, students made significant improvement in systematically learning vocabulary, avoiding procrastination toward reading assignments, and summarizing what is read (questions 5, 11, and 17). These are all behaviors that have been found to contribute to student success in college (see, for example, Flippo & Caverly, 1991; Pauk, 1984; Sotiriou, 1989; Vacca & Vacca, 1993).

The smallest change that was observed was in the likelihood of students creating visuals from what they read (question 9). The students rarely indicate previous exposure to non-linear review strategies like the creation of mind-maps and find

Table 2 *Analysis of Reading Attitudes*

Questions
23. I understand the world better because I read and write.
28. I believe reading and writing are important for success in a business world.
37. I am a better writer because I read.
38. Reading and writing will be important parts of my life.

Question #	Pre-average	Post-average	T(z)	Probability
23	3.79	4.272	3.21	.0016
28	4.337	4.467	1.11	.27
37	3.322	4.000	4.74	.0000
38	3.913	4.21	1.99	.048

some awkwardness in employing this strategy. However, there was a positive change indicating an increased ability or willingness to attempt this review strategy.

The students' attitudes toward reading all showed positive changes; however, it is interesting to note that students reported better *attitudes* toward reading than actual reading *behaviors* on the pretreatment inventory. The largest change in attitude occurred in the students' belief that they were better writers because they read (question 37). They also indicated that they understood the world better because they read and write (question 23). These indicate that important connections between reading and writing can be forged through whole language instruction. The students began the course with strong beliefs in the importance of reading and writing (questions 28 and 38) and felt even more positive about the values of these abilities on the posttreatment, even though they did not show as highly significant changes as on the other inventory items.

Limitations and Implications

There were some limitations to the research, as well as some grounds for future study. One major limitation of the study was the lack of a control group for study comparison. Use of a control group was not possible because 100% of the potential population (suspended students) were enrolled in the course, even though some of them failed to complete the inventories. Another limitation was the design of the survey instrument. Its original intent was to measure changes that took place in the students' reading and writing after completing the communications courses. Behaviors and attitudes were not identified as categories until after the research had begun. Therefore, there are disproportional numbers of behavior and attitude questions. The use of only four attitude questions may not be adequate to express the types of attitudinal changes that may occur.

Future research on the use of whole language instruction at the college level should include additional questions to measure the effect of reading attitude changes on class participants. In addition, more longitudinal research may reveal if the strong behavior changes that were noted continue to be evident as students depart the

program and reenter their academic majors. Completing the inventory a year and two years later may reveal if there is a lasting effect for these behavioral and attitudinal changes.

References

Flippo, R., & Caverly, D. (Eds.). (1991). *Teaching reading and study strategies.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, K. S. (1986). *What's whole in whole language?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Books.

Goodman, K. S. (1992). I didn't found whole language; Whole language found me. *The Reading Teacher, 46,* 188-199.

Harris, M. B. (1995). *Basic statistics for behavioral science research.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Harste, J. C. (1994). Literacy as curricular conversations about knowledge, inquiry, and morality. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hobson, E., & Shuman, R. B. (1990). *Reading and writing in high schools: A whole language approach.* Washington, D.C.: NEA Professional Library.

Horn, E. D. (1992). Whole language principles applied to a remedial reading course at Indiana University at South Bend. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354480)

Kanel, S., & Anthony, M. (1994, March). *What about the whole teacher? Creating a college whole-language classroom experience.* Paper presented at the Association for Childhood Education International Study Conference, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372042)

Levine, A. (1994). The great debate revisited. *Atlantic Monthly, 274,* 38+.

Pauk, W. (1984). *How to study in college.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Purcell, P. D. (1990). Whole language across the curriculum: Teaching and learning in a general chemistry class. In Blake, R. W. (Ed.), *Whole language: Explorations and applications.* Schenectady, NY: New York State English Council.

Ross, E. P. (1991-2). Moving toward a whole language college classroom. *Journal of Reading, 35* (4) 276-281.

Rupert, P. R., & Brueggeman, M. A. (1986). Reading journals: Making the language connections in college. *Journal of Reading, 30* 26-33.

Sinatra, R. (1991). Integrating whole language with the learning of text structure. *Journal of Reading, 43* (6) 424-433.

Sotiriou, P. E. (1989). *Integrating college study skills: Reasoning in reading, listening, and writing.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Vacca, R. T. & Vacca, J. L. (1993). *Content area reading.* NY: Harper Collins.

Weaver, C. (1990). *Understanding whole language: From principles to practice.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Books.

Whitt, A. G. (1994). Whole language revitalizes one high school classroom. *Journal of Reading, 37* (6) 488-493.

Willinsky, J. (1990). *The new literacy.* New York: Routledge.

Zaritsky, J. (1993). From bibliophobia to bibliophilia: Using whole language and reader response theory to change college readers. In P. Malinowski (Ed.), *Perspectives on practice in developmental education* (pp. 51-55). New York: College Learning Skills Association.

APPENDIX A

WHOLE LANGUAGE SURVEY

Name: _____

Please respond to the following using the legend:

A Always (5) U Usually (4) S Sometimes (3) R Rarely (2) N Never (1)

1.	A	U	S	R	N	I preview course readings.
2.	A	U	S	R	N	I write everyday, no matter what the purpose.
3.	A	U	S	R	N	I textmark course readings.
4.	A	U	S	R	N	I do not put off writing assignments until the last moment.
5.	A	U	S	R	N	I use a system to learn new terms from my course readings.
6.	A	U	S	R	N	Writing is one of the most exciting experiences I have.
7.	A	U	S	R	N	I take notes from my course readings.
8.	A	U	S	R	N	I have developed a voice by which people know that it is I who is writing.
9.	A	U	S	R	N	I develop visuals from my course readings.
10.	A	U	S	R	N	My writing is on the same par with my reading abilities.
11.	A	U	S	R	N	I don't procrastinate when reading a textbook.
12.	A	U	S	R	N	I write well enough for me.
13.	A	U	S	R	N	I spend time reviewing for tests/exams.
14.	A	U	S	R	N	I enjoy writing for whatever the reason, no matter what my writing skills.
15.	A	U	S	R	N	I use text parts to aid my reading (index, glossary, headings, etc.).
16.	A	U	S	R	N	I think positively about writing.
17.	A	U	S	R	N	I summarize readings for courses.
18.	A	U	S	R	N	I generally feel adequate when asked to write about something outside my field of study.
19.	A	U	S	R	N	I am a competent student.
20.	A	U	S	R	N	I do not feel anxious when I have to write reports, essays, or in-class exams.
21.	A	U	S	R	N	I use the processes a student must go through in order to be a good writer or reader.
22.	A	U	S	R	N	I believe that my writing skills are good enough for future expectations.
23.	A	U	S	R	N	I understand the world better because I read and write.
24.	A	U	S	R	N	I believe that the writing courses I have had in my college career to date have been effective in helping me become a good writer.
25.	A	U	S	R	N	I read often.

APPENDIX A

Continued

26.	A	U	S	R	N	I believe writing is important for me to be a well-rounded individual.
27.	A	U	S	R	N	The amount of time I devote to my course work is indicated by my grades.
28.	A	U	S	R	N	I believe reading and writing are important for success in a business world.
29.	A	U	S	R	N	I remember what I study.
30.	A	U	S	R	N	I believe I have a solid foundation of grammar and mechanics.
31.	A	U	S	R	N	I have no trouble focusing my concentration on my course work.
32.	A	U	S	R	N	I enjoy writing for certain subjects.
33.	A	U	S	R	N	I perform well on exams.
34.	A	U	S	R	N	I research material for academic writing assignments as called for.
35.	A	U	S	R	N	I think about and question what I read.
36.	A	U	S	R	N	I make good use of time and planning when I write.
37.	A	U	S	R	N	I am a better writer because I read.
38.	A	U	S	R	N	Reading and writing will be important parts of my life.
39.	A	U	S	R	N	I read and write better when I am interested in the topic.
40.	A	U	S	R	N	I look for classes whose requirements do not include writing assignments.

APPENDIX B
TEXT CHECK

_____ Name _____

Points _____ Text _____

Comments: Date _____

THE WORK THIS WEEK:

1) covers pages _____.

The topic is _____

I already know _____ a great deal about this.
_____ a bit about this.
_____ next to nothing about this.

My interest level is _____ high.
_____ medium.
_____ low.

Comments: _____

2) The information (is) _____ clearly organized/well-presented.
_____ difficult to work with.
_____ confusing.
_____ requires careful concentration.
_____ average in difficulty.

The main patterns of organization are:

_____ definition/example
_____ cause/effect
_____ compare/contrast
_____ time/sequence
_____ listing
_____ other

Signal words are used _____ frequently and effectively
_____ now-and-then
_____ rarely

Comments: _____

3) The vocabulary is _____ simple
_____ technical/complex
_____ clearly defined

Comments: _____

4) Important ideas are _____ easy to identify
_____ difficult to locate
_____ usually at the beginning of paragraphs
_____ often at the end of paragraphs
_____ found all over the place

Comments: _____

APPENDIX B

Continued

5) As I read this information, I keep myself actively involved by:

6) After I've read this information, I lock it in by:

7) My *review* strategies are:

8) The most interesting thing I've learned from this text this week:

9) The most challenging thing about the text this week:

10) Here's what I did this week that didn't work at all and I'll never do *that* again . . .

11) Here's what I did that was a terrific idea and I'm going to keep doing it . . .

12) Current grades (in the past week): _____ homework _____ test
_____ quiz _____ paper
CURRENT AVERAGE: _____ _____ other

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR TEXT SYSTEM:

not very X----------X----------X----------X----------X very

The Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies of College Freshmen and College Seniors

Barbara Martin Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

The primary purpose of this investigation was to identify and describe the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies of college freshmen and college seniors reading narrative and expository text. Forty-five college freshmen and forty-seven college seniors read either a narrative or expository passage, then rated their comprehension of the passage and reported the comprehension monitoring strategies spontaneously applied during the reading of the passage. Student comprehension was measured through free recall and cued recall tasks.

Both freshmen and seniors reported (a) using a variety of strategies to monitor comprehension of narrative and expository text, (b) consistent use of strategies across reading tasks, (c) infrequent use of particular strategies, and (d) differentially applying strategies to different text types. Seniors reading narrative text reported more frequent use of summarizing and demonstrated higher cued recall score than freshmen, a finding that supports developmental theories of metacognition.

At the college level print materials comprise a major source of course content. In fact, a number of survey studies indicate that both faculty and students rank reading as the most important activity for academic success in college (Chase, Carson, & Gibson, 1991). Often college reading assignments complement material covered by lecture, but more often at the college level, required readings supplant lecture material. Furthermore, reading of text is expected to be done by the student, independent of the class and/or professor. For the college student these text and task demands contrast with those of previous high school experience. Moore and Murphy (1987) reported that little reading was required of high school students they surveyed and that required reading often repeated lecture material, so many students could participate adequately in class without reading.

Orlando et al. (1989) investigated the text demands placed upon college students. They surveyed 256 first-semester freshmen and four professors at a large, western, urban college about the reading demands of a psychology class and an American history class. Results of the survey indicated that college students were expected to read between 600 and 750 pages per semester per class. Seventy-five percent of the students perceived that reading was assigned for the purposes of introducing or reviewing concepts covered in class; whereas, professors noted the above but added introducing new concepts and different points of view not covered through lecture. When asked to indicate the percentage of test questions taken from text material versus class activities, professors and students alike reported between 40% and 60% as derived from text. Though replication of Orlando et al.'s (1989) study is needed

with classes at different types of colleges and with students at different levels, preliminary findings indicate that college students are expected to read a lot of print material.

Research findings suggest a close relationship between students' ability to learn independently and academic success (Wang & Peverly, 1986). Since much of college learning appears to be learning from text, and since academic success is related to the ability to learn independently, it seems important, then, to find out more about how college students read to learn course-like materials (i.e., extended narrative and expository text).

The purpose of this investigation was to identify and describe the perceptions and knowledge college freshmen and college seniors brought to the tasks of reading narrative and expository text as well as the spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies they reported using while reading to learn from text. This investigation sought to determine: (a) if differences exist between college freshmen and college seniors (reading narrative and expository text) with respect to voluntary reading, assigned reading, value of reading, comprehension rating, and comprehension performance; (b) if differences exist between college freshmen and college seniors with regard to reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring of narrative and expository text; (c) if the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring of college freshmen correlates with verbal ability, voluntary reading, assigned reading, value of reading, comprehension rating, and comprehension performance; and (d) if the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring of college seniors correlates with verbal ability, voluntary reading, assigned reading, value of reading, comprehension rating, and comprehension performance.

Significance

Research in the areas of cognitive psychology and reading supports the view that as children mature, their capacity to use cognitive skills increases. Individuals become more metacognitively aware and better at regulating and controlling their reading comprehension. Yet research examining the metacognition and comprehension monitoring of adults suggests that neither metacognition nor comprehension monitoring are fully developed in all adults (Baker & Brown, 1984). Leading research designs in the field of adult metacognition include: (a) comparisons of the metacognitive abilities of skilled readers and unskilled readers (Baker, 1985; Gambrell & Heathington, 1981), (b) studies of the effect of contradictory text insertions on the perceived comprehension of college students (Epstein, Glenberg, & Bradley, 1984; Glenberg, Wilkinson, & Epstein, 1982; Schommer & Surber, 1986); and (c) intervention studies that employ strategies instruction in an effort to improve the metacognitive abilities of college students (Larson et al., 1985; Pressley et al., 1987).

Adult poor readers in the comparative studies did not possess knowledge of comprehension strategies, did not know how to handle comprehension failure, held misconceptions about the reading process (Gambrell & Heathington, 1981), and used different criteria to judge their comprehension than adult good readers (Baker, 1985). Reading ability appears to affect adult metacognitive awareness and comprehension monitoring.

Studies in the text contradiction paradigm reported that both good and poor readers failed to detect the contradictions and frequently misidentified logical text as contradictory when informed of the presence of contradictions (Epstein, Glenberg, & Bradley, 1984). It appears that inserted text contradictions do not discriminate good and poor readers at the college level.

Intervention studies manipulated strategy usage among college students. Through the use of adjunct questions, for example, students' perceived readiness for tests improved (Pressley et al., 1987). It appears that college students can become better monitors of text understanding and test preparedness by employing a variety of strategies. But what strategies do students spontaneously apply as they monitor their comprehension of continuous text akin to that of college course work?

The focus of this study is on the perceptions and knowledge college freshmen and college seniors bring to the tasks of reading continuous narrative and expository texts and thus provides needed descriptive data for the field of college reading.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were drawn from a pool of approximately 165 first-semester college freshmen and a somewhat smaller number of first-semester college seniors enrolled in required core courses in a small Catholic liberal arts college in an Eastern state. Criteria for inclusion in the study included: full-time student status, of traditional age (e.g., 18-19 for freshmen, 21-22 for seniors), have an SAT Verbal score in the college files, and have granted consent. The sample for the study consisted of 45 freshmen and 47 seniors. The mean SAT verbal for freshmen was 496 (SD = 62) and for seniors 456 (SD = 76). Mean scores on the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test (Deignan, 1973) were 29 (SD = 5) for freshmen and 30 (SD = 6) for seniors.

Three intact classes of freshmen enrolled in Western Tradition in Literature I (EN 102) and three intact classes of seniors enrolled in either Philosophical Ethics (PH 301) or Theological Ethics (TH 300) were selected from all sections offered (10 of EN 102, 4 of PH 301, 2 of TH 300) to serve as comparison groups. The primary criteria for selection of intact classes were that they be scheduled into 75-minute class periods, at mutually exclusive times, and taught by professors willing to allow the researcher into the class.

A small number of freshman (N = 7) and seniors (N = 6) served as key informants. They were interviewed about the spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies they used while reading the Research Packet passage and those they employ while reading a typical assignment for class. Key informants were drawn from a list of volunteers in each of the six classes according to the degree of agreement between their self-evaluation of comprehension and their comprehension performance (as measured by free recall and cued recall tasks) and their self report of spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies. Successful Spontaneous Comprehension Monitors were students who accurately rated their level of comprehension (Comprehension Rating as compared with Free Recall and Cued Recall performance) and reported frequent use of one or more comprehension monitoring

strategies (Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report). Unsuccessful Spontaneous Comprehension Monitors were students who failed to accurately rate their level of comprehension (Comprehension Rating as compared with Free Recall and Cued Recall performance) yet reported frequent use of comprehension monitoring strategies (Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report).

Materials

Two research packets were compiled for this study. One contained a narrative passage (Narrative Research Packet) and one contained an expository passage (Expository Research Packet). In addition to the reading selection each packet included: Delta Reading Vocabulary Test, Prereading Survey, Reading Prompt, Comprehension Rating, Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report, Free Recall Prompt, two lined pages for the Free Recall task, and Cued Recall Questions. Identical forms of the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test were used in both research packets. Parallel forms of the Prereading Survey, Reading Prompt, Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report, Free Recall Prompt, and Cued Recall Questions were used. All Research Packet materials were piloted with students of comparable age and ability.

Delta Reading Vocabulary Test. The Delta Reading Vocabulary Test (Deignan, 1973) is a 45-item vocabulary test. Each item consists of a stimulus word (e.g., predict) and five response words (e.g., certain, forecast, state, before, decide). The student selects a synonym for the stimulus word from the choices and circles it.

Prereading Survey. The 8-item Prereading Survey asked students to rate, using a 4-point scale, the frequency with which they read for a variety of purposes, their knowledge of passage and topic, and value of reading.

Passages. Two passages were selected from college level anthologies not used in the target college (Olsen, 1956; Ogbuaga, 1991). The narrative passage was a 12-page short story (approximately 3600 words) titled "I Stand Here Ironing." The expository passage, "Depo Provera: Choice or Imposition on the African Woman?" was modified slightly from the original to be comparable in length to the narrative passage. The modified version is a 7½ page research report (approximately 3700 words). Both passages were pilot tested with students similar in age and skill to the subjects of the study, rated to be of moderately high interest (as assessed by pilot testing interviews), and of low familiarity (as assessed through interviews with college faculty and second-semester seniors, pilot testing, and the prereading survey). Fry (1977) readability is grade 7.0 and grade 12.0 for the narrative and expository texts, respectively.

Although researchers have used narrative and expository text in comprehension monitoring studies (Zabrucky & Ratner, 1992, 1986; Zabrucky & Moore, 1989), the effects of text type on college student's spontaneous comprehension monitoring is unknown. Text structure specifies the logical connections among ideas as well as the subordination of some ideas to others (Meyer & Rice, 1984). Authors organize narrative and expository text differently as evidenced by the numerous text analysis procedures represented in the literature. Student evaluation and regulation of comprehension may vary in response to text type.

Three raters agreed on the presence of text structure elements (setting, theme, initiating event, and resolution for the narrative; setting, purpose, key terms, and conclusion for the expository), and critical text elements (25 critical events for the narrative; 27 critical points for the expository). Passages were photocopied to allow for the insertion of a reading prompt and four postreading activities.

Pre- and Postreading Activities. A short reading prompt preceded the reading selection. The prompt explained that the researcher was interested in finding out how people learn from reading. In addition, the prompt (a) outlined the postreading activities (Comprehension Rating, Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report, Free Recall, and Cued Recall); (b) explained that the Research Packet was not a test and was, therefore, untimed; (c) explained that completion of the Research Packet would not affect their course grade; and (d) expressed gratitude for participation.

The Comprehension Rating activity was a sentence completion task. Directions instructed students to circle the word that most accurately described their understanding of the passage in the sentence: I would rate my understanding of this passage as . . . very good, good, fair, poor. The second postreading activity, Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies (SCMS) Self Report, listed comprehension monitoring strategies gathered from extant research in comprehension monitoring and learning strategies, focus group data, and results of pilot testing. Directions for SCMS Self Report acknowledged that a variety of strategies are available to help students understand and learn from what they read and that the list may not be all inclusive. Students were advised to read over the entire list of spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies and to add any that were missing. For each spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategy listed students were to rate on a 4-point scale how much the strategy was actually used and to write a brief description of how it was used. Endpoints of the scale were 1 meaning "not at all" and 4 meaning "very often." An example was provided on the form to assist students as they completed the SCMS Self Report.

The third postreading activity, Free Recall, prompted students to write as much as they could remember about the passage for an audience unfamiliar with the passage. The final postreading activity, Cued Recall, consisted of twelve open-ended questions drawn from an original set of twenty questions. An item analysis during pilot testing plus expert judgment helped determine the questions to be used in the Cued Recall exercise. There were six comprehension questions that were textually explicit and six that were textually implicit. A panel of experts (e.g., certified Reading Specialists with a masters degree or beyond who have taught adult readers) verified that the questions were classified correctly. Cued Recall prohibited passage lookback.

Key Informant Interview. A series of questions was developed to prompt students to talk about the comprehension monitoring strategies they used to read the Research Packet passage and those they use to read a typical class assignment. Though the interview questions varied from interview to interview based on student responses, there was a core structure common to all that was established by a standardized opening statement.

Key Informant Reading Log. Key informants were asked to maintain a reading log of class assignments for a period of two weeks. To promote uniformity and ease of

reporting, a reading log was prepared by the researcher along with a sample of a completed reading log form. On the Reading Log form there was space for students to record (a) the number of pages assigned, (b) the total reading time required to complete the assignment, (c) a list of the comprehension monitoring strategies used to complete each assignment, and (d) a rating of their comprehension.

Pilot Studies

Pilot studies were conducted for the following purposes: (a) to test the feasibility and utility of materials, tasks, procedures, and directions; (b) to establish time requirements for reading the passages and completion of postreading activities; (c) to inventory student assessment of interest and difficulty of the passage; and (d) to determine the cued recall questions.

Six months before this experiment was conducted, 15 freshmen enrolled in an undergraduate core course at the target college participated in the first phase of pilot procedures. All materials except the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test and Cued Recall were piloted during this phase. As a result of information acquired during the first phase of the pilot study, the following modifications were made: (a) scripted oral directions drafted, (b) format changes to the SCMS Self Report, and (c) expository passage shortened.

The second phase of the pilot study provided information about item difficulties of the Cued Recall task and the utility of the adjusted directions and shortened text. Twenty-six seniors were asked to participate in this phase. These students were education majors enrolled in a required reading course at a large university. Results of this phase indicated that 75 minutes would be sufficient time to provide a 5-minute orientation, administer the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test (10 minute) and Research Packets (60 minutes). Based on an item analysis of the 20 cued-recall questions piloted, 12 items were selected for the Cued Recall activity to follow each passage.

Procedure

This study took place during the Fall Semester at a small Catholic liberal arts college in an Eastern state (total enrollment under 1500). After permission to conduct the study was granted by the college administration, the researcher met with professors of freshmen and senior core courses to discuss the study. Four professors agreed to allow the researcher into their classrooms for one 75-minute class period to collect student data and for one additional class period to collect observational class data.

Research Packets. Research packets were administered to participants in the regular classroom setting during Weeks 4 and 5 of the fall semester at the convenience of the professors. During the first five minutes the researcher shared general information about the study, oriented the participants to the procedures to be followed, and acquired consent from each participant. Then students were given 10 minutes to complete the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test. One half of each class was administered the Narrative Research Packet and the other half the Expository Research Packet. Prior to administration the packets were stacked in an alternating pattern. The researcher counted out the number of packets needed per row and

handed them to the first person who in turn passed them back the row. The same pattern of distribution was used with all classes (i.e., right to left, front to back). Participants had one hour to work independently through the research packets (Pre-reading Survey, Narrative or Expository Prompt and Passage, Comprehension Rating, SCMS Self Report, Free Recall, and Cued Recall). Students were asked to remain through the regularly scheduled class dismissal time.

Participants' SAT verbal score, year in college, major, and age were collected from student records. A confidential ID number was assigned to each participant.

Key Informant Interviews. Initial contact with key informants was by phone following preliminary analysis of the data. A followup letter explaining the nature of their participation (i.e., to be interviewed and to keep a reading log) was mailed. Interviews with key informants took place during Weeks 7-9 of the semester in a private study room of the college library. Key informants were interviewed individually for a period of approximately 30 minutes about how they read to learn the research packet passage and how they read a typical text assignment for the course. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

At the close of the interview session the researcher explained the purpose and procedures of the reading log, shared an example of a reading log entry, and gave 5 reading log forms (enough to cover a two-week period) to each key informant along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope so the reading logs could be returned by mail.

Class Visits. To gain an understanding of the role reading plays in each of the six classes and the degree to which key informants value class reading, a schedule of class visitations was planned to follow the interviews. During Weeks 10 and 11 of the semester the researcher observed each of the six classes for one class period. Key informant behaviors and teacher reference to text were the focus of researcher field notes.

Scoring Procedures

Free Recall. Procedures developed by Clark (1982) and modified by Morrow (1988) served as the model for the propositional analysis and scoring of the free-recall retellings. Some adaptations were necessary for use with extended narrative and expository text written retellings. Parallel outlines were constructed for each text that listed critical text elements. Two independent judges were asked to rate each element as critical, important, trivial, or unrelated to the text. For both passages interrater agreement was 98%. The same judges were asked to identify the text structure elements of each passage. For the narrative text, they were asked to identify story structure elements like theme, setting, and principal characters along with the initiating event. Similarly, for the expository passage the judges identified text structure elements such as purpose, topic, and key terms. Interrater agreement for this task was 92% for the narrative and 97% for the expository.

A Retelling Scoring Sheet was developed for each text passage. Text structure elements and critical text elements from the student retellings were matched to those of the content outline. Only text-based propositions were scored and repetitions were not counted. Propositions which were not text-based, but were elaborations appropriate to the text, were scored as positive elaborations. Propositions which

were inconsistent with the text or simply erroneous were scored as negative intrusions.

Interrater agreement was established by randomly selecting 10% of the free-recall retellings for scoring by two independent judges. For the narrative passage, interrater agreement was 92% for the scoring of the free-recall retellings for critical elements and 92% for the scoring of the text structure elements. For the expository passage, interrater agreement was 100% for the scoring of critical elements and 84% for scoring the text structure elements. The author scored the remainder of the free-recall retellings.

Cued Recall. A key of acceptable textually-derived responses was generated for each question on the Cued Recall task. Two independent judges verified the appropriateness of these responses. Student responses were scored as correct if they matched the answer key in gist. Interrater agreement was established by randomly selecting 10% of the cued-recall tests for scoring by two independent judges. Interrater agreement was 94% for the scoring of the narrative cued-recall questions and 98% for the expository cued-recall questions. For textually-explicit items on the cued-recall test interrater agreement was 100% for the narrative research packet and 96% for the expository research packet; whereas interrater agreement for textually-implicit items was 87% in the narrative research packet and 100% in the expository research packet.

The cued-recall task was scored for total number of correct responses to the twelve postreading questions, using the answer key of acceptable responses. Scores for number of correct responses to textually-explicit questions and scores for number of correct responses to textually-implicit questions were totaled.

Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies (SCMS) Self Report. The SCMS Self Report was scored in two ways. First, individual strategy ratings were recorded. This was the point value assigned to each strategy as representative of amount of use. Scores ranged from 0 for "not at all" to 3 for "very often" for each strategy. Second, a total score was calculated that took into account the number of strategies used, amount of use, and type of strategies used. Five independent judges (professors and doctoral students in reading) were asked to rate each of the ten strategies of the SCMS Self Report as requiring high, moderate, or low mental processing. Each level of processing was assigned a point value (3 = high, 2 = moderate, 1 = low) so that judges' ratings could be summed and averaged. Table 1 reports the means of expert ratings for each comprehension monitoring strategy.

The mean score on each strategy served as its weighting coefficient. All of the judges agreed that Summarizing required a high level of mental processing and that Subvocalizing required a low level. The weighting coefficient for Summarizing was 3, and 1 for Subvocalizing. But on none of the other strategies was there complete agreement among judges. In the case of Making Connections, for example, four judges rated it as a high mental processing task and one rated it as moderate. The coefficient for Making Connections became 2.8, the sum of judges' ratings (3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 2 = 14) divided by the number of judges (5). The Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Score was calculated for each individual by summing the products of the strategy weighting coefficient and student reported strategy use. The equation became (1.8 × reported use of Adjusting Reading Speed)

Table 1 *Means of Expert Ratings for Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report Items*

Strategy	Mean
Summarizing	3.0
Making Connections	2.8
Making Predictions	2.6
Writing Marginal Notes	2.6
Visualizing	2.4
Reading Selectively	2.4
Adjusting Reading Speed	1.8
Rereading	1.6
Underlining	1.4
Subvocalizing	1.0

+ (2.6 × reported use of Making Predictions) + (2.8 × reported use of Making Connections) + (1 × reported use of Subvocalizing) + (2.4 × reported use of Reading Selectively) + (1.6 × reported use of Rereading) + (3 × reported use of Summarizing) + (1.4 × reported use of Underlining) + (2.4 × reported use of Visualizing) + (2.6 × reported use of Writing Marginal Notes) = Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage score.

Documents, Field Notes, and Interviews. The narrative and expository passages from the Research Packets were examined for marginal notes, underlining, or other markings. Subsequently, they were compared with SCMS self-report data (all participants) and interview data (key informants) to verify that students took notes and underlined as reported.

Results

Preliminary analyses of the data revealed a statistically significant difference between freshmen and seniors with regard to verbal ability as measured by SAT Verbal, pooled variances $t = 2.79$ ($df = 90$, $p < .05$), but not for the Delta Reading Vocabulary Test, pooled variances $t = .781$ ($df = 90$, at $p < .05$). Therefore analysis of covariance procedures were used in subsequent analyses, with SAT Verbal and Delta as covariates. Table 2 indicates the means and standard deviations for freshmen and seniors on both measures of verbal ability.

The prereading survey used in this study revealed both similarities and differences between college freshmen and seniors. With regard to voluntary reading, both college freshmen and college seniors reported reading more often for information (Freshmen = 44%, Seniors = 57%) than for pleasure (Freshmen = 38%, Seniors = 25%).

There were significant differences, however, between freshmen and seniors with respect to the importance of reading to academic success, $F(1,88) = 4.31$, $p < .05$, and the importance of completing assigned readings, $F(1,88) = 6.83$, $p < .05$. Eighty-two percent of college freshmen reported that reading is "very important" to academic success in college as compared to only 57% of college seniors. Sixty-two

Table 2 *Comparison of College Freshmen and College Seniors in Terms of SAT Verbal and Delta Reading Vocabulary Test*

	Freshmen (N = 45)		Seniors (N = 47)		
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
SAT Verbal	496	62	456	76	2.79*
Delta	29	5	30	6	.78

*Significant at $p < .05$ level.

Note. Range of scores for SAT Verbal was 320–580 for college freshmen and 310–650 for college seniors. Range of scores for Delta Reading Vocabulary Test was 20–39 for college freshmen and 18–41 for college seniors.

percent of college freshmen reported completing assigned reading more often as compared to 45% of seniors.

Student self-evaluation of comprehension differed between freshmen and seniors. In the narrative text condition, 86% of the seniors rated their comprehension as "good" as compared to only 70% of freshmen. Within the expository text condition, freshmen and seniors rated themselves similarly (85%). Thus, seniors rated themselves as equally competent at reading exposition and narrative; whereas freshmen rated themselves as more competent at reading exposition.

In the Free Recall task, students were asked to retell as much as they could remember about the passage they read. Total propositions recalled became the score for the Free Recall task. Two additional scores were tabulated for the Free Recall task: elaborations and intrusions. Propositions which were not text-based, but were elaborations appropriate to the text, were scored as positive elaborations. Propositions which were inconsistent with the text or simply erroneous were scored as negative intrusions. The Cued Recall consisted of 12 open-ended questions, six of

Table 3 *Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Narrative Comprehension Performance*

	Freshmen N = 23	Seniors N = 21
Free Recall	5.59 (1.75)	5.10 (1.63)
Elaborations	3.65 (2.59)	1.57 (1.40)*
Intrusions	2.22 (1.45)	1.43 (1.25)
Cued Recall	7.65 (2.27)	9.48 (2.04)*
Textually Explicit	4.17 (1.23)	4.81 (1.36)
Textually Implicit	3.52 (1.38)	4.66 (1.02)*

Note. The maximum score for each student on Free Recall = 11, Cued Recall = 12, Cued Recall-Textually explicit = 6, Cued Recall-Textually Implicit = 6. There was no maximum designation for Elaborations or Intrusions.

Table 4 *Summary of Analysis of Covariance: Comparison of Groups for Elaborations in the Narrative Free Recall*

Source	df	SS (Adjusted)	MS (Adjusted)	F	p
Year in college	1	28.927	28.927	6.578	.014*
SAT Verbal	1	2.764	2.764	.629	.433
Delta	1	.906	.906	.206	.652
Error	40	175.90	4.397		

which were explicitly answered in the text, six were implicitly answered in the text. Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for college freshmen and college seniors on the Free Recall, Free Recall-Elaborations, Free Recall-Intrusions, Cued Recall Total, Cued Recall-Textually Explicit, Cued Recall-Textually Implicit.

A series of one-way AnCOVAs was conducted. In the narrative text condition there were statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level between college freshmen and college seniors on Free Recall Elaborations, $F(1,88) = 6.58$, $p < .05$; Cued Recall Total, $F(1,88) = 9.54$, $p < .005$; and Cued Recall-Textually Implicit $F(1,88) = 12.23$, $p < .001$. See Tables 4-6 for AnCOVA summaries.

Table 7 presents the means for college freshmen and college seniors assigned to the expository text condition on the Free Recall and Cued Recall tasks. The means and standard deviations for both groups were similar on all measures.

With regard to student spontaneous comprehension monitoring, strategies that students reported using "often" became the focus of analysis. Two separate comparative analyses were carried out. In the first, the spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies reported as used "often" by college freshmen and college seniors were analyzed *within* text groups (e.g., college freshmen and college seniors reading narrative text were compared; college freshmen and college seniors reading expository text were compared). In the second analysis, differences in the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies of college freshmen and college seniors *across* text types were compared (e.g., college freshmen reading narrative text and college freshmen reading expository text were compared; college seniors reading narrative text and college seniors reading expository text were compared).

Table 5 *Summary of Analysis of Covariance: Comparison of Groups for Narrative Cued Recall Total*

Source	df	SS (Adjusted)	MS (Adjusted)	F	p
Year in college	1	44.357	44.357	9.538	.004*
SAT Verbal	1	6.504	6.504	1.399	.244
Delta	1	.054	.054	.012	.915
Error	40	186.028	4.651		

Table 6 *Summary of Analysis of Covariance: Comparison of Groups for Narrative Cued Recall-Textually Implicit*

Source	df	SS (Adjusted)	MS (Adjusted)	F	p
Year in college	1	18.124	18.124	12.233	.001*
SAT Verbal	1	2.308	2.308	1.557	.219
Delta	1	.113	.113	.076	.784
Error	40	59.263	1.482		

How do freshmen and seniors differ with respect to spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies (reading narrative and expository text)? The strategies reported as used most "often" by the freshmen while reading the narrative text passage were Visualizing (74%), Making Connections (61%), Rereading (48%), and Adjusting Reading Speed (43%). Seniors reported frequent use of Visualizing (81%), Rereading (52%), Making Connections (43%), Adjusting Reading Speed (38%), and Summarizing (38%). Table 8 lists the frequency and percentage of students in the "often" category for each of the ten strategies for the narrative text group.

Through analysis of covariance, with SAT Verbal and Delta as covariates, the freshmen and senior adjusted means for each of the strategies were compared. The difference in summarizing proved to be the only statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level. Table 9 summarizes the results of the analysis of covariance for summarizing.

In the expository text group the strategies reported as used most "often" by the freshmen were Adjusting Reading Speed (59%), Visualizing (50%), Underlining (41%), and Subvocalizing (32%). Seniors reported frequent use of Adjusting Reading Speed (54%), Making Connections (50%), Underlining (38%), and Visualizing (35%). Table 10 presents the frequency and percentage of the response "often" for each of the Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report items.

Table 7 *Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Expository Comprehension Performance*

	Freshmen N = 22	Seniors N = 26
Free Recall	6.76 (2.13)	6.12 (2.35)
Elaborations	.82 (1.01)	.69 (1.09)
Intrusions	.59 (.85)	.58 (.90)
Cued Recall	8.82 (2.09)	9.73 (2.18)
Textually Explicit	4.5 (1.14)	5.0 (1.06)
Textually Implicit	4.32 (1.17)	4.73 (1.46)

Note. The maximum score for each student on Free Recall = 11, Cued Recall = 12, Cued Recall-Textually explicit = 6, Cued Recall-Textually Implicit = 6. There was no maximum designation for Elaborations or Intrusions.

Table 8 *Frequency and Percentage of the Response "Often" for Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report—Narrative*

Strategy	Freshmen N = 23	Seniors N = 21
Adjusting Reading Speed	10 (43%)	8 (38%)
Making Predictions	1 (4%)	4 (19%)
Making Connections	14 (61%)	9 (43%)
Subvocalizing	5 (22%)	7 (33%)
Reading Selectively	0	0
Rereading	11 (48%)	11 (52%)
Summarizing	4 (17%)	8 (38%)
Underlining	6 (26%)	6 (29%)
Visualizing	17 (74%)	17 (81%)
Writing Marginal Notes	1 (4%)	2 (9%)

Note. Individual students reported using multiple strategies "often."

A comparison of the adjusted means for freshmen and seniors for each comprehension monitoring strategy through an analysis of covariance, with SAT Verbal and Delta as covariates, revealed no statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$.

Comparison of Overall Reported Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage. In order to gain an overall picture of the reported comprehension monitoring of college freshmen and college seniors reading narrative and expository text, it was first necessary to derive an Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies score for each individual that would account for the number of strategies used and the intensity of reported use.

Table 11 lists the means and standard deviations for the derived Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage variable.

The Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage Score served as the dependent variable in an analysis of variance of freshmen and seniors' reported usage of spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies for both text groups (narrative and expository text). For neither text condition were there statistically significant differences between the adjusted means.

Table 9 *Summary of Analysis of Covariance: Comparison of Narrative Groups for Summarizing*

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Year in College	1	3.391	3.391	4.398	.042*
SAT Verbal	1	1.584	1.584	2.054	.160
Delta	1	.808	.808	1.048	.312
Error	40	30.841	.771		

Table 10 *Frequency and Percentage of the Response "Often" for Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies Self Report-Expository*

Strategy	Freshmen N = 22	Seniors N = 26
Adjusting Reading Speed	13 (59%)	14 (54%)
Making Predictions	2 (9%)	3 (12%)
Making Connections	4 (18%)	13 (50%)
Subvocalizing	7 (32%)	5 (19%)
Reading Selectively	4 (18%)	3 (12%)
Rereading	6 (27%)	6 (23%)
Summarizing	3 (14%)	6 (23%)
Underlining	9 (41%)	10 (38%)
Visualizing	11 (50%)	9 (35%)
Writing Marginal Notes	1 (4%)	0

Note. Individual students reported using multiple strategies "often."

Do college freshmen and college seniors report that they differentially apply comprehension monitoring strategies to narrative and expository text? To answer this question, differences between the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies of freshmen reading narrative text and freshmen reading expository text and of seniors reading narrative text and seniors reading expository text had to be identified. Strategy usage across text types compared differences with regard to type and number of strategy reported.

What kind of strategies did freshmen and seniors report using with narrative and expository text? A difference of 15 percentage points was used to demarcate significant differential strategy use. For freshmen, five of the strategies achieved a difference of 15% or higher. For three of the five strategies the difference was in favor of the narrative text. They are reported here in decreasing order: making connections, with a difference of 43%; visualizing, with a difference of 24%; and rereading, with a difference of 21%. The remaining two strategies that achieved a difference of 15% or more for freshmen were adjusting speed (difference of 16%) and underlining (difference of 15%), and these favored the expository text. Two of

Table 11 *Means and Standard Deviations (in parentheses) for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage for All Groups*

Group	N	Mean (SD)	Range
Narrative			
Freshmen	23	19.12 (1.71)	5–36
Seniors	21	22.51 (2.07)	9–38
Expository			
Freshmen	22	18.56 (1.69)	6–35
Seniors	26	18.43 (1.50)	1–32

the strategies reported as applied more often to narrative text, making connections and visualizing, were classified by a panel of experts to be in the moderate/high-level category. Both of the strategies reported as applied more often to expository text, adjusting reading speed and underlining, were classified as low-level strategies by the same panel. Frequency counts and percentages for each comprehension monitoring strategy are presented in Table 12 for freshmen.

Table 12 *Frequency and Percentage of the Response "Often" for Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage for Freshmen*

Strategy	Narrative N = 23	Expository N = 22
Adjusting Reading Speed	10 (43%)	13 (59%)
Making Predictions	1 (4%)	2 (9%)
Making Connections	14 (61%)	4 (18%)
Subvocalizing	5 (22%)	7 (32%)
Reading Selectively	0	4 (18%)
Rereading	11 (48%)	11 (52%)
Summarizing	4 (17%)	8 (38%)
Underlining	6 (26%)	9 (41%)
Visualizing	17 (74%)	11 (50%)
Writing Marginal Notes	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

Note. Individual students reported using multiple strategies "often."

There were significant differences between the reported spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategies of seniors reading narrative text and seniors reading expository text as well. Four of the strategies achieved a difference of 15% or higher. Three of the four exhibit a difference in favor of the narrative text. They are visualizing, with a difference of 52%; rereading, with a difference of 29%; and summarizing, with a difference of 15%. Only one of the strategies achieved a significant difference in favor of the expository text and that was adjusting reading speed with a difference of 16%. Of the strategies reported as applied more often to narrative text by seniors, visualizing and summarizing require a higher level of processing than adjusting reading speed, the strategy reported as applied more often to expository text. Frequency counts and percentages for each comprehension monitoring strategy for seniors across text are presented in Table 13.

How Many Strategies Did Freshmen and Seniors Report Using With Narrative and Expository Text? To further examine across-text differences of spontaneous comprehension monitoring strategy usage for college freshmen and college seniors, the amount of strategies reported as used "often" and total number of strategies reported were compared across narrative and expository text. Freshmen reported a similar pattern of strategy usage for both the narrative and expository texts, with the majority of students in both text groups reporting frequent use of three or more strategies. The maximum number of comprehension monitoring strategies reported as used "often" was six for both text groups. The pattern of strategy usage reported

Table 13 *Frequency and Percentage of the Response "Often" for Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage for Seniors*

Strategy	Narrative N = 21	Expository N = 26
Adjusting Reading Speed	8 (38%)	14 (54%)
Making Predictions	4 (19%)	3 (12%)
Making Connections	9 (43%)	13 (50%)
Subvocalizing	7 (33%)	5 (19%)
Reading Selectively	0	3 (12%)
Rereading	11 (52%)	6 (23%)
Summarizing	8 (38%)	6 (23%)
Underlining	6 (29%)	10 (38%)
Visualizing	17 (81%)	9 (35%)
Writing Marginal Notes	2 (9%)	0

Note. Individual students reported using multiple strategies "often."

by seniors in the narrative text varied little from that of seniors in the expository text. The majority of students reported frequent use of three or more strategies in both text groups. The maximum number of strategies reported as used "often" was seven for narrative and eight for expository.

Students indicated frequency of use for each of the comprehension monitoring strategies on a Likert-type scale. Total reported strategy usage includes not only strategies reported as used "often," but also strategies reported as "used, but not often." Fifty-six percent of freshmen reported using a total of 5 or more strategies when reading narrative text as compared with 64% of freshmen reading expository text.

To determine if a statistically significant relationship exists between total number of strategies reported and comprehension, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated. For freshmen, total number of strategies reported was positively correlated with comprehension for both narrative ($r = .412$) and expository ($r = .120$) text. Neither correlation was statistically significant.

Seventy-one percent of seniors reading narrative text reported using a total of 5 or more strategies as compared with 73% seniors reading expository text. It is interesting to note the wider range of totals reported by seniors in the expository group. For seniors, total number of strategies reported was positively correlated with comprehension of narrative text ($r = .301$), but negatively correlated with comprehension of expository text ($r = -.219$). Neither of the correlations was statistically significant.

What is the Relationship Between Reported Use of Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies of College Freshmen and Seniors and Verbal Ability, Voluntary Reading, Assigned Reading, Value of Reading, Comprehension Rating, and Comprehension Performance? To answer this question Pearson product moment correlations were calculated in two steps. First, correlations between Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and prereading measures were

Table 14 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and Measures of Verbal Ability, Reading Practices, and Value of Reading for College Freshmen*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Overall SCMS (1)	1.00	.051	.173	.065	.067	.104	.290
SAT Verbal (2)		1.00	.743*	.243	.004	.390*	.329*
Delta RVT (3)			1.00	.159	−.037	.313*	.226
Voluntary Pleasure Reading (4)				1.00	−.037	.194	−.104
Voluntary Informational Reading (5)					1.00	.075	.247
Assigned Reading (6)						1.00	.264
Value of Reading (7)							1.00

r.05/43df = .2942

calculated. Then, correlations between Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and postreading measures were calculated for each text type.

Prereading measures of interest included two measures of verbal ability, SAT Verbal scores and Delta Reading Vocabulary Test. The remaining variables of interest were self-report data collected by means of a prereading survey. They included student estimates of frequency of voluntary reading for pleasure and information, frequency of completing assigned reading, and student rating of the value of reading to college academic success. Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage did not correlate significantly with any of the prereading measures for freshmen. However, for seniors there was a significant correlation between Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy and SAT Verbal (r = .290). Tables 14 and 15 list the Pearson product moment correlations for step 1 of the analysis for freshmen and seniors respectively.

Table 15 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and Measures of Verbal Ability, Reading Practices, and Value of Reading for College Seniors*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Overall SCMS (1)	1.00	.290*	.13	.050	−.019	.181	.116
SAT Verbal (2)		1.00	.661*	.180	.228	.108	.315*
Delta RVT (3)			1.00	.454*	.088	.248	.330*
Voluntary Pleasure Reading (4)				1.00	.112	.132	.064
Voluntary Informational Reading (5)					1.00	.332*	.339*
Assigned Reading (6)						1.00	.554*
Value of Reading (7)							1.00

r.05, 45df = .2875

Table 16 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and Measures of Comprehension (Perceived and Actual) for College Freshmen in the Narrative Group*

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall SCMS (1)	1.00	−.119	.068	.595*	.404
Comprehension Rating (2)		1.00	.008	−.183	−.101
Free Recall (3)			1.00	.078	.649*
Cued Recall (4)				1.00	.809*
Total Recall (5)					1.00

r.05/21df = .4144

Pearson product moment correlations were calculated for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and all postreading measures of comprehension for both the narrative and expository text conditions. Comprehension Rating refers to student self-appraisal of reading comprehension collected immediately after reading. Comprehension performance was measured by Free Recall, a written retelling, and Cued Recall, 12 free-response questions. Student scores on the free recall and cued recall tasks were standardized, then aggregated to derive Total Recall. Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage correlated significantly with Cued Recall for both freshmen and seniors (r = .571) reading narrative text. Tables 16 and 17 list Pearson product moment correlations for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and measures of comprehension (perceived and actual) for freshmen and seniors in the narrative group respectively.

Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage did not correlate significantly with comprehension measures for either freshmen or seniors reading expository text. Tables 18 and 19 list Pearson product moment correlations for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and measures of comprehension (perceived and actual) for freshmen and seniors in the expository group respectively.

Table 17 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and Measures of Comprehension (Perceived and Actual) for College Seniors in the Narrative Group*

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall SCMSU (1)	1.00	.075	.201	.571*	.428
Rating (2)		1.00	.516*	.209	.445*
Free Recall (3)			1.00	.445*	.811*
Cued Recall (4)				1.00	.885*
Total Recall (5)					1.00

r.05/19df = .4329

Table 18 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategy Usage and Measures of Comprehension (Perceived and Actual) for College Freshmen in the Expository Group*

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall SCMS (1)	1.00	.263	−.285	−.277	−.301
Rating (2)		1.00	.126	.146	.146
Free Recall (3)			1.00	.740*	.934*
Cued Recall (4)				1.00	.931*
Total Recall (5)					1.00

r.05/20df = .4227

Key Informant Data Analysis

Key informants were asked to talk about the assigned reading in the courses from which they were selected. Specifically, students were asked to describe a typical reading assignment and to tell what they do to help them understand while they read assignments in the target class.

Reported Comprehension Monitoring Strategies for Class Assignments. Tallies of comprehension monitoring strategies identified by key informants during the interviews and from the reading log entries of key informants provide supportive data regarding the patterns of reported strategy use of college readers reading narrative and expository text (i.e., most frequently reported as used "often," total number of strategies employed, and type of strategies employed) and the differential use of strategies by college students with regard to text type.

In response to the question, "What do you do as you read one of Professor A's assignments to help you understand?," key informants talked freely about what strategies they used. There was no list of strategies or pointed questions to influence interview self reports. For the purposes of analysis, however, student responses were categorized according to the strategies listed on the SCMS Self Report. It was necessary to add a strategy to the list because both freshmen and seniors reported talking to others as a way of helping them understand course materials.

Table 19 *Correlation Matrix for Overall Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring and Measures of Comprehension (Perceived and Actual) for College Seniors in the Expository Group*

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall SCMS (1)	1.00	.152	−.066	−.246	−.217
Rating (2)		1.00	.299	−.129	.105
Free Recall (3)			1.00	.076	.756*
Cued Recall (4)				1.00	.710*
Total Recall (5)					1.00

r.05/24df = .3892

The prominent strategies reported as used by freshmen key informants to monitor their comprehension of a typical Western Traditions reading assignment were adjusting reading speed (86%), making connections (71%), rereading (71%), visualizing (71%), underlining (71%), and writing marginal notes (71%). Key informants reported more frequent use of underlining and writing marginal notes for narrative class assignments than for the narrative text passage in the Research Packet. However, the reported frequencies of adjusting reading speed, making connections, rereading, and visualizing mirrors the pattern established by freshmen in the narrative text group. Table 20 lists the strategies that freshmen key informants reported using while reading an assignment for Western Traditions.

Table 20 *Frequency and Percentage of Freshmen Key Informants who Reported Using Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies to Complete Course Narrative Reading Assignments*

Strategy	N = 7	
Adjusting Reading Speed	6	86%
Making Predictions	0	
Making Connections	5	71%
Subvocalizing	3	43%
Reading Selectively	3	43%
Rereading	5	71%
Summarizing	2	29%
Underlining	5	71%
Visualizing	5	71%
Writing Marginal Notes	5	71%
Talking with Others	3	43%

Senior key informants reported using adjusting reading speed (100%), summarizing (83%), making connections (67%), making marginal notes (67%), and underlining (50%). Like the freshmen key informants, seniors reported more frequent use of making marginal notes and underlining to facilitate comprehension than was previously reported in the testing situation. Though adjusting reading speed, summarizing, and making connections were reported as used often in both situations, not one key informant mentioned visualizing as a comprehension monitoring strategy while reading for class, a contradiction to SCMS Self-Report data. Table 21 lists the strategies that senior key informants reported using while reading an assignment for their ethics class.

Discussion

What is known about the college reader as a result of this study? First, the college reader applies a variety of comprehension monitoring strategies to narrative and expository reading. The majority of college readers in the present study applied five or six different strategies to their reading. Research in this area has provided mixed

Table 21 *Frequency and Percentage of Senior Key Informants who Reported Using Spontaneous Comprehension Monitoring Strategies to Complete Course Expository Reading Assignments*

Strategy	N = 6	
Adjusting Reading Speed	6	100%
Making Predictions	0	
Making Connections	4	67%
Subvocalizing	1	17%
Reading Selectively	2	33%
Rereading	5	83%
Summarizing	3	50%
Underlining	5	71%
Visualizing	0	
Writing Marginal Notes	4	67%
Talking with Others	2	33%

results. Wade, Trathen, and Schraw (1990) reported that some undergraduates in their study used a diversity of study tactics to process expository text but others did not. Snyder and Pressley (1990) reported that almost all undergraduates in their study relied on a single strategy (nonselective rereading) to understand expository text. Because the present study relied heavily on self reports on student thinking as evidence of the comprehension monitoring strategies spontaneously applied while reading, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of self-report data. Students may have under-reported or over-reported strategy use. However, the interview data (not prompted by a checklist) provided confirming evidence regarding student use of a variety of monitoring strategies.

Second, the college reader consistently applies a core of strategies across reading tasks. Over and over students in their written self reports reported that they visualized and adjusted reading speed while reading narrative and expository text. Below are student remarks from key informant interview transcripts that underscore the prominent role visualizing and adjusting reading speed play.

> *Visualizing*
> . . . when I read, if I understand what I'm reading I'm getting the whole story. That's why I like reading so much, cause it actually is like a movie. I can picture the characters and what they're doing . . . it makes it more interesting which is probably why I don't mind reading so much.

> *Adjusting Reading Speed*
> Right now I'm taking a class, International Politics, and we have a book called *Taking Sides*. And what it is is pro side and con side, say to the question "Is the world population growing too quickly?" or something like that. Now I already know something about that, from my other studies, so I don't sit down and study that as much. I read it through and then like at the end I get both sides of the argument. Textbooks on the other hand, I tend to read parts slower because there tend to be a lot of definitions, a lot of factual information that'll be helpful. It's [*Taking*

> *Sides*] not nearly . . . it's a lot more detailed, but the topics are stuff I've touched on before.

Analysis of key informant interview data expanded the list of core strategies to include making connections, making marginal notes, and underlining, strategies that did not figure prominently in the SCMS Self-Report data. This may be explained, in part, by the likelihood of a test in the target course at some future point in time. At the outset of the present study students were told that they would read and be tested on what they read in one 75-minute session. Even though students were asked to read the research packet passage as they would normally read in preparation for class and urged to do their best work, students knew their performance would not affect their course grade and may have read less strategically.

Third, the college reader is equally consistent in the strategies not used or used minimally. The most surprising "omission" was making predictions. Written self-report data revealed that only 11% of the college students in this study reported making predictions while reading narrative and expository text and none of the key informants reported its use. Research of the last decade (e.g., Palinscar & Brown, 1984) has emphasized the importance of predicting to reading comprehension. What can account for the infrequent reported use of making predictions in this study? Perhaps the college freshmen and seniors in this study made predictions automatically and subconsciously. Perhaps the amount of reading assignments college students are expected to complete does not allow sufficient time to predict or perhaps the instructional style of college professors discourages prediction. Whatever the cause, it is interesting that neither freshmen or seniors in this study reported frequent use of prediction.

A fourth characteristic of the college reader is the differential application of strategies to meet text and task demands. Written self-report data showed that the college reader more often visualized and reread with narrative text but more often adjusted reading speed and underlined with expository text. Key informant interview data provided confirming evidence for the differential utilization of comprehension monitoring strategies. In a study of sixth graders, Zabrucky and Ratner (1992) reported that text type influenced regulation of understanding. Results of this study support the findings of Zabrucky and Ratner (1992).

Fifth, the college reader is proficient in their knowledge of and reported use of comprehension monitoring strategies as evidenced by the pattern of responses on the SCMS Self Report and key informant interview data. Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson (1991), in their review of comprehension monitoring research, reported that comprehension monitoring is what distinguishes the adept or sophisticated reader from the inexperienced novice reader. The adept reader exhibits declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge when he uses (a) time and energy to an advantage, (b) available resources, such as looking back at the text, to resolve a problem, and (c) different strategies in different circumstances.

Finally, the college reader is still developing metacognitively. One important difference between the reported comprehension monitoring of college freshmen and college seniors was that seniors reading the narrative text reported frequent use of summarizing as a comprehension monitoring strategy where freshmen did not. This finding provides support for the notion that summarization is developmental in

nature (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991) and that adult readers continue to develop metacognitively (Baker, 1989). To illustrate the type of summarizing reported, one of the senior key informants explained how he used summarizing to monitor his comprehension.

> Well, if you can't outline what you just read in your head, get the general idea in your head, then you know you missed the point. I know a lot of times I'll read something and I'll think about it for a second afterwards. And if I don't know . . . if I can't tell myself, "Well, this is what I read," I don't mean every detail, but generally, then I missed the point.

The positive relationship between perceived and actual comprehension performance of seniors in the narrative text group further supports the notion of increased cognitive and metacognitive abilities for college seniors. Seniors (62%) in the narrative group more accurately rated comprehension performance than freshmen (35%). One possible explanation may be that seniors processed narrative text at a higher level than freshmen, organizing what they read in such a way so as to make it easily retrievable. Perhaps it is that college seniors have had more experiences reading narrative text and are, as a result, more metacognitively aware of text and task differences and more adept at evaluating their comprehension. Core curriculum requirements of the target college include courses in literary criticism which emphasize analytical thought about text. Perhaps core courses then, or simply the college learning experiences of the preceding years provided more narrative text experience for seniors which, in turn, affected seniors' narrative recall and self-evaluation. The impact of college cannot be discounted (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

How adults learn from text is an area in need of research. Merriam (1987) reviewed the literature in adult learning theory and concluded that there are only tentative formulations about how adults learn. To that end Afflerbach and Pressley (1992) have formulated a model of adult expert reading. They synthesized research findings of verbal report studies of expert readers (i.e., graduate students, professors, other professionals) reading either self-selected text or researcher-selected text in and out of their field of expertise. To date they have organized the expert reader model around three major headings that seem to represent recursive and interdependent components: Encoding, Monitoring, and Evaluation. In other words, expert readers continually encode, monitor, and evaluate as they read. Expert adult readers monitor what they encode. They evaluate their monitoring and they encode the results of their evaluation.

The present study is not a study of experts, but it is a study of proficient traditional-age college freshmen and seniors reading college-level text. Comparative research of this nature informs adult learning theory through the identification of similarities and differences between populations of adult readers. Results of the present study support and extend the work of Afflerbach and Pressley (1992) by providing a profile of another population of adult readers—traditional-age college readers.

In summary, results of this study call into question the common complaint that college students are not prepared for the task of independent reading and learning

[as reported by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in Pugh & Pawan (1991)]. In this study with two passages, students reported using a variety of strategies to monitor their independent reading and learning, differentially applying strategies across texts. The college reader appears to have the wherewithal to monitor learning of a single college-level task in a controlled situation. Results of this study also provided insights into some important differences between freshmen and senior year, suggesting that as college students mature their capacity to use cognitive skills increases. Furthermore, this study revealed that there are important differences in comprehension monitoring strategy knowledge and implementation with regard to text type. When studying spontaneous comprehension monitoring it is important to address the issue of text type, since metacognition is a situated variable. In conclusion, results of this study support the contention of other researchers (Garner, 1990; Simpson, 1991) that there is much to be learned about the developmental nature of comprehension monitoring during the college years.

References

Afflerbach, P., & Pressley, M. (1992, December). Verbal reports and reading research: Recent accomplishments and continuing concerns. In C. Walker (Chair), *Methodological perspectives on literacy processes and learning.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Baker, L. (1985). Differences in the standards used by college students to evaluate their comprehension of expository prose. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 297-313.

Baker, L. (1989). Metacognition, comprehension monitoring, and the adult reader. *Educational Psychology Review, 1*(1), 3-38.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 353-394). New York: Longman.

Chase, N. D., Carson, J., & Gibson, S. (1991, December). Texts, notes, and lectures: Perceptions of reading purposes and demands in four college courses. In N. D. Chase (Chair), *College as a discourse community: Research perspectives on academic literacy.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Palm Springs, CA.

Clark, C. H. (1982). Assessing free recall. *The Reading Teacher, 35,* 434-439.

Deignan, G. D. (1973). *The delta reading vocabulary test.* Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(2), 239-264.

Epstein, W., Glenberg, A. M., & Bradley, M. M. (1984). Coactivation and comprehension: Contribution of text variables to the illusion of knowing. *Memory and Cognition, 12,* 355-360.

Fry, E. (1977). Fry's readability graph: Clarifications, validity and extension to Level 17. *Journal of Reading, 21,* 242-252.

Gambrell, L. B., & Heathington, B. S. (1981). Adult disabled readers' metacognitive awareness about reading tasks and strategies. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 23*(3), 215-222.

Garner, R. (1990). When children and adults do not use learning strategies: Toward a theory of settings. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(4), 517-529.

Glenberg, A. M., Wilkinson, A. C., & Epstein, W. (1982). The illusion of knowing: Failure in the self-assessment of comprehension. *Memory and Cognition, 10,* 597-602.

Merriam, S. B. (1987). Adult learning and theory building: A review. *Adult Education Quarterly, 37*(4), 187-198.

Meyer, B. J. F., & Rice, G. E. (1984). The structure of text. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 319-351). New York: Longman.

Moore, D. W., & Murphy, A. G. (1987). Reading programs. In D. E. Alvermann, D. W. Moore, & D. W. Conley (Eds.), *Research within reach of secondary school reading: A research guided response to concerns of reading educators.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Morrow, L. M. (1988). Retelling stories as a diagnostic tool. In S. M. Glazer, L. W. Searfoss, & L. M. Gentile (Eds.), *Reexamining reading diagnosis: New trends and procedures.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review, 84,* 231-259.

Ogbuaga, S. (1991). Depo Provera—A choice or an imposition on the African woman? In S. Bates, A. Hunt, J. Jarvis, & S. Spear (Eds.), *Writing about the World* (pp. 135-146). Washington, DC: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Olsen, T. (1956). I stand here ironing. In T. Olsen (Ed.), *Tell Me A Riddle* (pp. 1-12). New York: Delta.

Orlando, V. P., Caverly, D. C., Swetnam, L. A., & Flippo, R. F. (1989). Text demands in college classes: An investigation. *Forum for Reading, 21*(1), 43-48.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1,* 117-125.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pressley, M., Snyder, B. L., Levin, J. R., Murry, H. G., & Ghatala, E. S. (1987). Perceived readiness for examination performance (PREP) produced by initial reading of text and text containing adjunct questions. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 219-236.

Pugh, S. L., & Pawan, F. (1991). Reading, writing and academic literacy. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *College reading & study strategy programs* (pp. 1-27). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schommer, M., & Surber, J. R. (1986). Comprehension-monitoring failures in skilled adult readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78,* 353-357.

Simpson, M. L. (1991, December). Trends in post-secondary strategy research: Where we are and where we need to focus our future efforts. In S. L. Nist (Chair), *The status of post-secondary study strategy research.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Palm Springs, CA.

Snyder, B. L., & Pressley, M. (1990). *What do adults do when studying for a test with unpredictable questions?* Technical Report. London, Canada: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology.

Wade, S. E., Trathen, W., & Schraw, G. (1990). An analysis of spontaneous study strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25*(2), 147-166.

Wagoner, S. A. (1983). Comprehension monitoring: What it is and what we know about it. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(3), 328-346.

Wang, M. C., & Peverly, S. T. (1986). The self-instructive process in classroom learning contexts. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 11,* 370-404.

Zabrucky, K. (1990). Evaluation of understanding in college students: Effects of text structure and reading proficiency. *Reading Research and Instruction, 29*(4), 46-54.

Zabrucky, K., & Ratner, H. H. (1992). Effects of passage type on comprehension monitoring and recall in good and poor readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*(3), 373-391.

Zabrucky, K., & Moore, D. (1989). Children's ability to use three standards to evaluate their comprehension of text. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24,* 336-352.

Practices

University and Classroom Conversations: Transformative Education Found, Lost, and Found Again

Nina Zaragoza
Florida International University

Jane Devick
University of Houston-Victoria

Deborah Beam

The development of a strong and personal philosophy is critical for the education of reflective practitioners (Giroux, 1988). This strength of voice will help beginning educators weather some of the inherent storms they will encounter (Zaragoza & Scardina, 1997) as they implement a program that is founded on critical theory (Freire, 1973; Giroux, 1988; Kincheloe, 1993; Zaragoza, 1997).

This paper will examine the design and expansion of one field-based university language arts methods course (Tarazona & Zaragoza, 1997; Zaragoza & Slater, 1996) where students are systematically pushed to develop a strong, personal philosophical foundation. The major professor of this course, the beginning professor involved in the course expansion, and an undergraduate student who has worked with both will also share their thoughts about this endeavor and its influence on another course taught by the beginning professor.

Project FUSE

Project FUSE (Field-University School Education) undergraduate language arts students receive all of their methods instruction from the university professor and public school teacher within an elementary school classroom as they work together with the elementary school children. The purpose of this model of instruction is to help develop reflective practitioners who will have the desire and ability to set up critically transformative classrooms (Tarazona & Zaragoza, 1997; Zaragoza & Slater, 1996).

This project takes place within an urban classroom which is part of the fourth largest school district in the United States. Public school students come from predominantly African-American or Haitian-American heritage. The majority of the university students come from Cuban-American or South American heritage.

This discussion will center around the thoughts of the major professor (Nina) and a professor just finished with her dissertation who served as a participant in the project for one semester (Jane) as they designed and implemented a six-hour experimental literacy course within a public school classroom. Jane will also discuss her campus-based reading methods course in light of her new learning during

Project FUSE. Finally, Deborah will share her experiences as a student in Project FUSE and in Jane's campus-based reading course.

The Idea

Nina

When Jane approached me about working together on Project FUSE I was both excited and hesitant. The thought of combining a reading and language arts course into a six-hour block was definitely exciting. I had actually combined two introductory special education courses and it worked out beautifully. For the first three hours my students participated in various classrooms while I circulated to lend support, and for the last three hours we came together as a class at the school site to discuss assigned readings in relation to their classroom visits.

But the thought of collaborating with another colleague was not as inviting as it used to be. I had team teaching experiences at the university that were instructive but also quite draining; I wondered if I even had the energy to try again. In one experience there were contradictions between what one particular colleague said and what she actually did in relation to the course and students. For example, we all seemed to agree on certain issues such as on-going assessment and enabling students to make meaningful connections, but in the actual teaching and grading of this colleague our agreements were not at all evident in her case (Cruz & Zaragoza, 1997).

I was frank with Jane about my misgivings and fears and clearly stated that unless she and I could agree on some major philosophical principles I would not attempt this experimental course. I also asked her to visit me at the elementary school so that she could become more familiar with the elementary school program (Zaragoza, 1997) and how the undergraduate students are blended into the children's community.

Jane

I had heard a lot about Project FUSE during faculty meetings and various local presentations that Nina and her students made. I was excited about it but could not really envision what it all looked like in action. I was pleased that Nina was willing to consider this experimental course.

Nina

Jane's excitement about the project energized me. Her questions and comments helped me to realize that she and I did agree on the philosophical issues and pedagogical principles of Project FUSE. That undergraduate education must be intricately bound to classroom practice is a major tenet. This connection is evidenced in a number of ways:

All or most undergraduate course work is conducted within a classroom setting over the entire semester. This classroom work is integrated within the course design and is not counted for separate field work hours. As part of the general education requirements, though, students must work in another field setting for two hours a week in conjunction with all their undergraduate methods courses. Therefore, Proj-

ect FUSE students are involved in the setting where the course is housed in another weekly setting.

Classroom settings are illustrative of the best we have to offer in education. This education is directly connected to the philosophy espoused by our College of Education as written in our mission statement which includes the education of reflective and critical practitioners who view themselves as intellectuals able to transform classrooms into respectful, collaborative communities. These communities are based on social constructivism where all types of knowledge are valued.

All relationships within the project are collaborative in nature. Therefore, professor and classroom teacher are involved in all major aspects of instructional design. Undergraduate students are not observers of the classroom but are active participants within the classroom community at all times. In this way everyone is valued and respected and all are seen as both teachers and learners.

Jane

I was mesmerized with what I saw when I visited the elementary school classroom. There were 28 children and 25 undergraduate university students participating together in all aspects of literacy. When children recite poetry so do the undergraduate students; when children are reading silently from their personal reading books so are the undergraduates and all adults in the classroom. After about two hours of work the undergraduates meet alone for conversation. Nina does not traditionally lecture but allows all major issues to emerge from community interactions.

I observed the concrete connection between philosophy and practice. Even during the first class the university students were forced to connect what they saw in the classroom to philosophical beliefs. For example, one of the first conversations focused on the physical classroom design. What was so interesting was how the students were pushed to connect immediately as questions were directed at them.

- Why do you think the desks are placed in clusters?
- What does this say about my beliefs about learning?
- How do I think people learn?
- What do you think about what is on the walls in the room?
- What does this say about my educational philosophy?
- Who makes the decisions about what gets hung up? Why?
- When children have the opportunity to make decisions, what am I saying about what I believe is my role as an educator?

That these students could so quickly begin to talk about philosophical issues was incredible but also understandable. They had been immersed in an elementary school classroom founded on a consistent and clear philosophy that was apparent in each and every pedagogical decision. Thus, they saw the philosophy in action, received strong, positive facilitation from their professor and were therefore already reflecting critically on classroom practice.

I was excited to become a part of this and decided to begin to adjust my campus-based literacy courses to be less lecture-oriented and much more interactive. It all looked so easy, so effective, and so powerful.

Setting it Up

Nina

Jane came to visit Lake Elementary consistently over the semester and after a number of discussions we decided to give this experimental six-hour literacy block a try. I was hopeful that it would be beneficial for all of us because of the excitement and common ground Jane and I shared. I especially liked the idea that these students would be with me and the children for almost the entire school day. What an opportunity for these undergraduates to participate so intensely in a classroom so early in their career. I knew already how powerful it was for students who have been with me for three hours—imagine six!

While I was confident about successfully designing and implementing this kind of course, I was uncertain how it would work out with two professors. We both agreed that we did not want to traditionally split the hours between us (i.e., Jane facilitating the first three hours and I facilitating the next). I wondered how it would work out with two facilitators. I was nervous about having too much teacher talk with two professors and not enough time for student connections.

Jane

I also wondered how the two of us would share the work of facilitation. I was not sure exactly how I would fit into the way Nina questioned the undergraduate students. She was very fast-paced; there definitely was no wasted time. I guessed that I would pick up the rhythm and then be able to enter the conversation. We decided that I would initially observe and take notes and when I thought I was ready to jump in I would.

The Semester Begins

Nina

How refreshing it was to have these 25 students with us at the school almost the entire day. I felt comfortable and unrushed. I think Jane and I did a good job designing a syllabus that enabled students to begin to almost immediately envision their future classroom. The inclusion of reflection logs pushed students to critically analyze all readings in relation to their experiences and future decisions. Reflection logs facilitated their development as reflective educators. Over the years I have developed a fairly systematic way to push undergraduates along toward continued growth in thinking. First, through written and verbal feedback I encourage students to connect personally to the readings and the experiences in the classroom. These connections may include past educational experiences, present personal experiences as a university student, connections to their field work, connections to Lake Elementary, and finally connections to their future decisions as a teacher.

After about three weeks I would push students even harder to envision their own rooms by directly saying and writing, "I only want to hear about your room now. I don't want you to quote anyone else but yourself. Let me hear loud and clear what you will do in your classroom and why. The "why" of your decision will tell me about what you believe in, what connections you are making."

Jane

I saw that by two or three weeks into the semester most students were already personally connecting to all material and making tentative decisions about their future literacy program. When Nina really began to push them to only talk about their future room they became even stronger.

I could see that the amount of time devoted to responding to these journals paid off quickly. Nina's style of response was based on positive encouragement. When I first responded I had the tendency to be overly corrective and brief. For example, my comments would immediately point out what they were missing: "No, you shouldn't do this." I did not elaborate, recognize the effort or positively encourage further thinking. Nina had shown me examples of her responses before I even attempted to do it on my own, but I guess under the pressure of getting these done each week, I reverted back to a more traditional way of response.

Nina

I discussed with Jane my way of response and also shared specific examples. The examples illustrated how my responses follow a pattern of encouragement along with firm positive directives toward deeper reflection and connections.

I know that at first she was overwhelmed with the amount of written response I would give to each student, generally a comment each page. In addition, I would conclude with a complete comment that included a date, the greeting, body, and closing. For example:

> *Hi Deborah,*
>
> *I really see you are making connections to some of your past teachers. Now I want you to push yourself to talk more about what you will do as a teacher. How have your past experiences influenced your future decisions?*
>
> *Let me hear you say "In my classroom I will _____because" In this way your future classroom will emerge.*
>
> *How is your mother doing? I hope things are getting better.*
>
> *See you soon,*
> *Nina*

If you notice I give Deborah academic and personal responses because my students are also required to keep personal diaries which I respond to each week, as well. Here I am modeling the elementary school program (every morning all my children write in their diaries) and also the belief that part of teaching is forming positively connected relationships with all learners.

The next level of response would push students even further in their thinking and elaborating upon their future classroom. For example;

> *Hi Deborah,*
>
> *Hope all is well. I see you are really pushing yourself to make important decisions about your room. Good! Now I want you to elaborate even more as you connect all your decisions all the way to internalized learning. Remember what we've been discussing in class—Safety—Risk taking—Making meaningful choices—Internalized learning. In this way your philosophy and practice will be naturally linked. Also, begin talking*

about how you will implement all your decisions. Keep going! We're almost there!

I appreciate all the time you've dedicated to these reflections. It will be well worth it for you and your future students!
Keep reflecting, Nina

Yes, all this response takes a lot of time, but semester after semester I have seen students emerge as strong educators who really knew what they would do in their rooms, why they would do it, and how they would implement all their decisions. These reflective logs, too, were directly correlated to their final project which required them to talk fully and clearly about their future literacy program. Our time and reflection allowed all students to successfully complete the course.

Jane

I began to feel more comfortable about responding to students' reflections over the semester and began to understand the power of complete responses. I wrote at least one comment on each page and ended with a full response that included both a specifically positive remark as well as a response that would continue to push them to elaborate and connect more fully.

But I was still feeling uncomfortable about jumping in to facilitate both the elementary school students and the university students. The way Nina taught was so tight, so incredibly orchestrated and intertwined with what the students were seeing in the elementary school classroom that there did not seem to be an opening for me. The first few times I tentatively interjected seemed awkward and out of step. I was not sure what to do about this.

After the third class session we thought that I could try opening up the discussion with the university students. When the children go to their special area classes (i.e., music, physical education) we talk to the university students alone. Nina usually opens the discussion with comments from their reflective logs and in this way the issues that need to be covered have already been first identified by students. As she responds to the log she writes the students' names down on a sheet of paper and any point or connection that she wants to share with the community she notes next to the particular student's name. For example, she might begin with, "Julie talked about how she would make sure that children were allowed to choose what to read and her own experiences with self selection in school. How does past experience influence our feelings and success with reading?"

Personal comments are also shared so that community members get to know each other as full people. So, for example, if someone is planning a wedding it might be shared in this way: "Roxy, how are the wedding plans going? Did you decide on your dress yet?"

I had seen Nina open up the classes in this way through the semester and during my initial visits last semester. I was excited about opening class; It seemed an organized and positive approach! I was less than pleased about putting it into practice. As I wrote in one of my journal entries: *"Today I discussed personal and reading logs with the class. My personal connections did not connect to all of the students' strengths. I reverted to conducting the discussion about the readings in a traditional manner by making my connections first. Reflecting, I realized that when*

I observed everything was in such synchrony it appeared that conducting this type of program just happens. But in fact, it is very structured and requires a great amount of reflection about the connection of philosophy and practice where philosophy and practice are the same. Also watching Nina teaching is like watching a maestro conducting a symphony and I have gotten caught up into listening to her so when I am asked to participate I've lost my voice."

Nina

I was taken aback as I watched Jane guiding the discussion which actually was a lecture. While she did question the students the questions required low level answers and were not at all connected to the reading logs. For example, "What does the author say about readiness?" I had been working all semester to push these students to talk about what they believe, not what the author says, so these types of questions surprised the whole community and in fact kept them silent. I was puzzled about why Jane did this. I wondered if whether she had failed to put in the time to respond fully to the journals and just decided to wing it. I knew that she had a good amount of opportunity to be part of this type of discussion and she told me she really agreed with such connective instruction. After the session I asked Jane what happened.

Jane

I could tell Nina was disappointed with the opening of the discussion. I was nervous and relieved when she took over. I was actually hoping she would have interrupted but I guess it was worth the experience. It definitely fueled our conversation after the session.

I did respond to the journals that week and had some notes on some of the connections the students made. I think that what happened was that while I knew what to do and could talk about it, I definitely had not internalized this practice. When left alone I moved toward what was more safe and familiar. Pretty eye-opening for me! It caused me to wonder, too, was I even ready to facilitate this class?

Nina

I also wondered how Jane would be able to participate more as a facilitator. I think these early attempts were not successful for a few reasons. First of all, Jane only came to Lake Elementary once a week for this course. Therefore, while the elementary school students were familiar with her she was not as integral a part of the classroom. Because I was in the classroom at least twice a week for two full days and I continued to mentor the first year classroom teacher, I had deep connections to the children and the curriculum. Jane did not have these connections and while she understood the philosophical principles that underlie this type of classroom she had no experience with its practice.

When Jane and I spoke about these issues we realized that because it was all so complex maybe it was best if Jane continue to observe as a participant for the rest of the semester and continue to make the connections she needed to internalize the practice that went along with her philosophy. This made me feel better, too, because I was feeling uncomfortable that I was doing all the facilitation and that Jane might be thinking I did not want her help. We clearly were not working at the same

rhythm. The whole thing is like a balancing act—making sure both the elementary school and university students are getting what they need. I did not feel like I could sacrifice what I knew worked with this blended community to allow someone to interrupt the flow of it all.

Jane

I was concerned that I was not carrying my weight of the course and that Nina was doing all the work. She assured me that she would be doing it all anyway whether I was here or not and that she thought we needed to look beyond this semester to working together in the future. I was quite relieved when we decided that I should just step back and enjoy the learning experience. I would still respond to the logs but I would not have to worry about stepping in as a facilitator. I felt comfortable, at this point, as more of a participant.

I decided to visit the classroom more often during the week so that I could work with the children and curriculum without the university students being there. In this way, I could gain more experience in this kind of teaching and begin to connect to the children on a personal level. I think they may not have known who I was or thought I was another undergraduate student.

I also began to implement some of what I was learning with Nina into a campus-based course I was teaching. I wanted to practice some of the questioning techniques I was learning. I also wanted to adapt the course delivery so that there was more interaction between the students and myself. I was excited! I wondered how it would all work, though, without these classes being in the field observing and working with the children.

Nina

Jane mentioned that she was concerned that students in her campus-based class might not get a full picture of literacy because of not being able to see its practice. I reminded her, though, that if this type of instruction was a part of her belief system the students will be experiencing it throughout her course wherever it is held. I advised that she go slow and continue to examine her beliefs and work on being consistent in her practice. Indeed, this inconsistency could cause students to feel unsafe and confused and perhaps shut down totally.

Jane

After observing Nina I felt that I was ready to practice the questioning techniques, respond to reflection logs, and provide more opportunities for classroom interaction. Intellectually I understood the importance of this model of instruction to develop reflective educators who have the understanding and strength to critically transform their classrooms. But that's where it stopped. As the semester progressed I realized I was still learning about how to develop a transformative classroom and transforming this course on campus was more complicated than I had ever imagined. To my horror, I was using Nina's program as a recipe instead of modeling reflective pedagogy.

As I tried to structure a classroom atmosphere filled with meaningful discussion and reflection I found my belief system was still developing dramatically. Directing the course was a continual personal learning experience. Moment to moment and day to day new realizations emerged that helped me put reflective pedagogy into practice. Using Nina's questioning techniques, responding to the reflection logs, and facilitating class discussions from these logs turned out to require deep thinking and constant reflection. The traditional delivery model of instruction based on lecture with which I was formerly comfortable now became a difficult task. I spent long hours and sleepless nights preparing for my classes. There were times when I thought, "What have I gotten myself into?" I was stretching myself both personally and professionally. I had gone beyond intellectualization. I was changing how I lived by life.

Several of my students had already had Nina's class. They had strong voices and felt comfortable sharing their views about effective instruction with the rest of the class. I did not realize that since Nina's students had internalized the connection between philosophy and practice their voices would be stronger than mine. I never expected this to happen and was not prepared to provide the structure needed to continue to facilitate this strength of voice. Suddenly, my students began to separate themselves into two camps, the traditionalists and the transformers. We all began to view each other as philosophical adversaries rather than partners. We began to feel unsafe and unsure of ourselves.

I asked myself, "How can I make sure all of my students feel safe in our classroom?" I tried stepping back into a more traditional delivery of the material but I could no longer lecture or develop graphic organizers with my students because we were no longer comfortable with such learning approaches.

I was struggling to provide strong and positive direction about pedagogical decisions but it was difficult since I was still developing my belief system. As the semester progressed I realized that I needed to be honest with myself and my students about how I was still developing as an educator. Because of this openness the classroom atmosphere began to change. We all began to work together and discuss different pedagogical issues and how our personal philosophies are put into practice. Ultimately, we all became co-constructors of our knowledge as traditional boundaries dissolved and we grappled with learning, understanding, and reflecting on critical pedagogy. Every class session was a new experience as we stepped away from traditional teaching toward a more reflective model of teaching and learning.

I was told by many students that they grew from this experience. Knowledge leads to growth and change and I know that I would not have reached this point without the experience of my semester with Nina and my students. It is a complicated and heart wrenching task to begin to bridge the gap between critical philosophy and practice. Boundaries between classrooms and life fade. Your belief system becomes the reflective mirror of change.

I now realize that practicing reflective pedagogy means that you have felt the need to transform your belief system and your world. These changes are not intellectual; they are life changes. There is no difference between what you believe and who you are. This transformation was a personally slow and difficult journey. There

are no appropriate recipes here. This adage comes to mind: many of us can "talk the talk" but we must also be prepared to "walk the walk."

Deborah

My first exposure to Dr. Zaragoza's philosophy came in a primary reading course I took with Jane Devick. It was obvious to me from day one that Jane was excited about sharing some new ideas with us. It was also obvious, though, she was not quite sure on just how to present them or put them into practice. While she was strongly advocating the creation of a safe community, there was enormous negativity and as students we felt unsafe. After all, here was our teacher, our leader, and she did not appear to have all the answers. We grew angry and became increasingly vocal about our allegiance to traditional practices.

I was reluctant to accept anything that did not coincide with my traditional education background. I was waiting for the necessary steps to teach a child how to read. I wanted the recipe. Meanwhile, Jane continued to dwell on choice. I had a difficult time understanding the reasons behind giving students so much choice and could not imagine choice and structure could coexist in a classroom. The idea was very unsettling because I wanted clear boundaries between teacher and student. I would not even budge on my feeling about competition and held onto my belief that competition promotes excellence. Jane was advocating practices that flew in the face of 15 years of schooling.

A few weeks into the semester Jane changed her tactics. She took the risk of telling us more about herself as a person, a teacher, a mother and about her decision to redevelop her philosophical foundation. Almost immediately I began to see strength where I used to see vulnerabilities. I found myself listening to Jane more intently and realized what an undertaking it must have been to change her way of teaching at this point in her career. What would drive a person to undertake such a challenge and put herself in an exposed position?

This inspired me to begin to read and investigate further. My philosophy emerged and strengthened through my search. Jane reinforced my quest for knowledge as she discussed teachers' responsibility to become independent learners. She spoke about the role of teachers and learners being reciprocal in the classroom. Our reading class certainly became a living example of that. As the old boundaries between teacher and student faded a new bond was established and I looked forward to this class with renewed energy. I felt like I was constructing knowledge with Jane while building the framework for my own philosophy.

The following semester I took Dr. Zaragoza's language arts course. This was my chance to see how these new beliefs were practiced in an elementary school classroom. Seeing this philosophy come alive was like watching a well orchestrated concert. No wonder Jane got so involved with Nina and her passionate ideas.

Because of these two classes my educational philosophy has become more clear. I am now more aware of how my beliefs will influence curriculum, classroom structure, and my relationship with my students and their families. I am now a firm believer that if I am well grounded in my principles I will have greater success with my students than if I merely devise a series of lessons. These basic philosophical principles will be the heart that pumps life into my learning community. I am now

also more aware of how I must constantly reflect upon my decisions in order to stay true to my philosophy. Just having a philosophy does not automatically change old habits. I had once thought that by having philosophical principles in my mind and heart the practice of these principles would naturally take place. I have learned, though, by watching Jane and then Nina, that it takes deep reflection to communicate my philosophy through words and action. It does not just come naturally. It is an art form that must be developed, practiced, and refined.

References

Cruz, B., & Zaragoza, N. (1997). The road to collaborative and integrated education: Success and struggle in a university classroom. *Teacher Educator,* 32(3), 135-151.

Freire, P. (1993). *Education for critical consciousness.* NY: Continuum.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning.* MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Kincheloe, J. (1993). *Toward a critical politics of teacher thinking mapping the postmodern.* Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey.

Tarazona, J., & Zaragoza, N. (1997). University and public school connections: One preservice teacher tells her story with her professor. *The Teacher Educator,* 32(3), 185-197.

Zaragoza, N. (1997). *Rethinking language arts: Passion and practice.* NY: Garland.

Zaragoza, N., & Slater, F. (1996). Project FUSE: Connecting theory and practice in undergraduate methods. *Educational Transitions,* 1(1), 11-15.

Zaragoza, N. & Scardina, M. (1997). The critical transformation of a special education classroom: A first year teacher puts theory into practice. In S. Steinberg & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Students creating knowledge.* NY: Routledge.

Factors Associated with Computer-Mediated Pre-Writing and Reading Activities

Bob Lucking and Ray Morgan
Old Dominion University

Ann Woolford-Singh
Tidewater Community College

This study was conducted with students in a community college developmental English class where electronic conferencing was the major approach in learning to expatiate ideas. Four independent measures and one self-assessment test were given to determine whether electronic conferencing correlated with good writing, reading, and more complex thinking on the part of the students involved. A computer analysis was generated and descriptive statistics derived. Results are given and implications are drawn on the relationship between reading and writing and computer-mediated expiation.

Most teachers at all educational levels use writing activities that are mainly product-oriented and graded. Research has shown, however, that writing can be a powerful tool to assist comprehension. Jacobs (1987) has noted that writing can be compared to the ordering of thought. It is the formation of clusters of ideas from a student's experiences and imagination. It is a conscious shaping of concepts selected by the writer to be included in a composition. The student, then, uses those elements of craftsmanship that he or she can manage. The question is how these experiences are affected when students are asked to brainstorm and take part in the formulation of ideas in a different milieu than what is encountered by a student acting alone or even with a small group of peers. *How is the writing craft affected by reading, brainstorming, and writing in an electronic classroom environment where interaction is synchronous and computer-mediated with a whole class of students?* This question provides the impetus for this research.

Literacy in a Technological Environment

The issues of literacy and reading improvement have been made even more complex in recent years by the emerging forces of cyberspace. Literacy demands are being redefined by reading and writing as they exist on the World Wide Web, e-mail, and other forms of electronic communication. Newly-defined opportunities now exist for teaching and learning over an electronic, non-linear, asynchronous form of communication, and with them have risen new fields of scholarship and new

lines of research necessary to understand the demands placed on us as fully empowered educators of a literate, technological society. This study attempts to document the influence of extended experiences of students reading and writing in a context of what has come to be known as computer-mediated communication (CMC), which is task-related and interpersonal communication conducted by a computer.

The scholarship in this area that has emerged during the past decade has spawned a series of new definitions and considerations necessary to establish a common starting point for dialogue among scholars. This study focused on text used in synchronous electronic conferencing conducted over a local area network (LAN). As such, it used groupware (software) supplied by the Daedelus Group's Interchange, which allowed each student to type at a computer in "chat" form about topics established by the instructor. These writing environments are much like Multi-User Domains (MUDs) (see Fanderclai, 1995). Since students participate in quickly evolving, overlapping electronic 'conversations,' the very definition of text potentially changes. Some researchers (Bruce, Peyton, & Batson, 1993) have argued that the flow of text from 25 typing hands is faster than a single person talking, and idea production developed differently, particularly since on one writer controls coherency and development. Such networked classrooms place the teacher in a role of lesser authority (Cooper & Selfe, 1990), and the resultant discussions are more freewheeling and informal. In fact, Daisley (1994) describes a propensity among students for play in such interchanges.

Similarly, Takayoshi (1994) argues that electronic communication carries with it a less well developed sense of social etiquette, and the technologies "transmit social information poorly" (p. 66). Noting these discrepancies, Dean Barclay (1994) in his examination of written e-conference discourse finds it more informal, approaching qualities of speech, and he contrasts it with the usual language of academe. Using Batkin's (1992) theories of literacy reading, Barclay points to academic writing as being marked by high socio-ideological levels: official, closed, authoritative, serious, and coercive. Electronic discourse, he argues, fits Batkin's definition of being decentralized, unofficial, inclusive, relative, and playful.

If we think that pre-writing is a good activity for clarifying students' cognitive structure to enhance comprehension, then does the specialized form of "talk written down" called electronic conferencing correlate with better writing, better reading, and more positive thinking for students who are involved?

Research Design

The design of this study was post-hoc correlational in nature since its intention was to examine the perspective research avenues in reading and electronic conferencing, areas lacking empirical investigation. Participants in this study were 37 students enrolled in two sections of English 01 at Tidewater Community College. These sections represented the lowest level English courses at the College. It was the lower of two developmental levels. The study was eight weeks in duration.

A total of four independent measures and one self-assessment were used as the

basis for this study. Students were administered the Computer Attitudes Survey (CAS) which yielded a composite score and four subscores reflecting students' attitudes toward the use of computers in their lives. The CAS is a validated measure. The four subscores included the following:

1. Anxiety—degree of anxiety caused by interaction with computers,
2. Confidence—degree of confidence in working with computers,
3. Liking—degree of enjoyment in working with computers,
4. Usefulness—perceived value of computers in society.

The students were also administered the Mikulecky (1979) Behavioral Reading Attitude Measure to assess their attitude toward reading. This is a validated and nationally recognized attitude measure.

In the study two other measures were taken as part of the procedure: The Metacognitive Strategies Index (MSI) and a writing sample to test writing ability. The Metacognitive Strategies Index (adapted from Schmitt, 1990; Forget, Morgan, & Antinarella, 1996) is a 25 item test which assesses how well students process text and think metacognitively (reproduced as Appendix A). The MSI measures student abilities important to reading such as predicting and verifying, previewing, purpose setting, self questioning, drawing from background knowledge, summarizing and applying fix-up strategies. The students were also required to write an essay at the beginning of the course which was scored using a rubric agreed upon by the researchers. The rubric is reproduced as Appendix B.

Finally, students were asked to merely indicate the amount of computer experience they had prior to entering the course.

Results

A computer analysis of all data was conducted and descriptive statistics derived. The means and standard deviations are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1 *Means of Key Variables*

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Computer Composite Scores	3.27	.442
Computer Anxiety	3.88	.390
Computer Confidence	3.23	.592
Computer Liking	3.18	.579
Computer Usefulness	3.21	.450
Essay Scores	49.05	12.28
Attitude Toward Reading	64.46	10.98
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.03	3.66

Table 2

Correlation Between Essay Scores and Metacognitive Strategies Index		
Essay Scores	49.05	
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.03	Pearson 0.022358
Correlation Between Essay Scores and Metacognitive Strategies Index		
Essay Scores	49.05405	
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.02703	Pearson 0.022358
Correlation Between Attitudes Toward Reading and Metacognitive Strategies Index		
Attitudes Toward Reading	64.45946	
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.020703	Pearson 0.0263291
Correlation Between Computer Attitudes and Metacognitive Strategies Index		
Composite Computer Attitudes	3.272297	
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.02703	Pearson 0.17793
Correlation Between Computer Anxiety and Metacognitive Strategies Index		
Computer Anxiety	3.456456	
Metacognitive Strategies Index	12.02703	Pearson 0.250907
Correlation Between Essay Scores and Computer Composite Scores		
Essay Scores	49.05405	
Computer Composite Scores	3.272297	Pearson 0.066877
Correlation Between Attitudes Toward Reading and Computers		
Mean of Computer Attitudes	3.272297	
Mean of Reading Attitudes	64.45946	Pearson 0.246498
Correlation Between Liking and Experience		
Attitudes Toward Liking	3.178378	
Amount of Experience	4.485714	Pearson 0.404175

Secondly, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were carried out to identify relations between and among sub-sets of variables. They are shown in Table 2.

Conclusions and Implications

While the data gathered in this preliminary study have not led to grand pronouncements or overwhelming conclusions about the potential role of technology in literacy instruction, it is heartening to know that the possibilities for scholarship remain vast. The exact relationship between and among reading and writing and computer-mediated expatiation is not at all clear, and to what degree one contributes to a more literate person is uncertain. One finding that seems clear is that no variable we have studied—reading attitudes, computer attitudes, reading ability, writing ability,—precludes students' abilities to use electronic conferencing. That is, there

were no variables that predisposed students for success in using electronic media or resulted in one group, (e.g., students who liked computers), to have an advantage over another.

One implication of this study is that the force of technology in our future is quite clear. A new report (Edupage, 1997) shows that 10 million children under 18 are using the Internet, half of them in schools. The problems for students and teachers of the future will be how to navigate and assimilate enormous quantities of information, and the demands of literacy will be extended to a new electronic environment. Our sentiments are captured by an article in *Time* magazine (Wuff, 1997): "All kids, not just ones from families that can afford a home computer, should grow up with a mouse in their hand. As a learning tool, computers make kids adventurers and avid learners, taking them beyond the traditional walls of the schoolhouse" (p. 65). We believe that the issue of cost of technology is becoming less important with the passing of time, and computers open up a whole new array of possibilities of teaching and learning. Through computer technology and the Internet, students can learn the skills to find and manipulate information while building knowledge and becoming an empowered learner.

References

10 Million Kids on Line. [On-Line]. Available: WWW/Edupage/.

Barclay, D. (1994). "Ire, Envy, Irony and ENFI: Electronic Conferences as Unreliable." *Computers and Composition, 12*(1), 23-44.

Batkin, G. (1992). "Theoretical dimension of electronic communications." *College English, 15,* 4, 213-217.

Bruce, B., Peyton, J. K., & Batson, T. (Eds.) (1993). *Network-Based Classrooms: Promises and Realities.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, M. M., & Selfe, C. L. (1990). "Computer Conferences and Learning: Authority, Resistance, and Internally Persuasive Discourse." *College English, 52*(8), 847-869.

Daisley, M. (1994). "The Game of Literacy: The Meaning of Play in Computer-mediated Communication." *Computers and Composition, 11*(2), 107-120.

Fanderclai, T. L. (1995). "MUD's in education: New Environments, New Pedagogies." *Computer-Mediated Communication Magazine, 2*(1), 8-17.

Forget, M., Morgan, R., & Antinarella, J. (1996). *Teachers Manual For Reading For Success.* Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Co.

Jacobs, L. (1987). Reading, writing, remembering. *Teaching Pre K-8, 18,* 38.

Schmitt, M. (1990). A questionnaire to measure children's awareness of strategic reading process. *The Reading Teacher, 49,* pp. 454-461.

Mikulecky, L., Shanklin, N., & Caverly, D. (1979). Mikulecky Behavioral Reading Attitude Measure. In *Adult Reading Habits, Attitudes and Motivations: A cross-sectional study.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education.

Takoyoshi, P. (1994). "Building New Networks from the Old: Women's Experiences with Electronic Communications."

Wuff, S. "How to: Teach Our Children Well." *Time, 150,* 17, 62-96.

Appendix A

METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES INDEX

Adapted by Mark A. Forget

Directions: Think about what kinds of things you can do to help you understand a textbook reading better before, during, and after you read it. Read each of the lists of four statements and decide which one of them would help *you* the most. *There are no right answers.* It is just what *you* think would help the most. Circle the letter of the statement you choose.

I. In each set of four, choose the one statement which tells a good thing to do to help you understand a reading from a textbook better *before* you read it.

1. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. See how many pages are in the reading.
   B. Look up all of the big words in the dictionary.
   C. Make some guesses about what I think the reading is about.
   D. Be sure I can answer the questions at the end of the last chapter.
2. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Look at the questions at the end of the chapter.
   B. Decide how long it will take me to read the chapter or section.
   C. Sound out the words I don't know.
   D. Check to see if the reading is making sense.
3. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Ask someone to read the chapter to me.
   B. Read the title to see what the chapter is about.
   C. Check to see if most of the words have long or short vowels in them.
   D. Check to see if the pictures are in order and make sense.
4. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Check to see that no pages are missing.
   B. Make a list of the words I'm not sure about.
   C. Use the title and pictures to help me make guesses about what it will be about.
   D. Read the last sentence so I will know how the chapter ends.
5. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Decide on why I am going to read the chapter.
   B. Learn all the difficult words I can.
   C. Reread some parts to see if I can figure out what is happening if things aren't making sense.
   D. Ask for help with the difficult words.
6. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Retell all of the main points that have happened so far.
   B. Ask myself questions that I would like to have answered in the chapter.
   C. Think about the meanings of the words which have more than one meaning.
   D. Look through the chapter to find all of the words with three or more syllables.

7. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Check to see if I have read this chapter before.
   B. Use my questions and guesses as a reason for reading the chapter.
   C. Make sure I can pronounce all of the words before I start.
   D. Think of a better title for the chapter.
8. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Think of what I already know about the things I see in the pictures.
   B. See how many pages are in the chapter.
   C. Choose the best part of the chapter to read again.
   D. Read parts of the chapter aloud to someone.
9. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Practice reading the chapter aloud.
   B. Retell all of the main points to make sure I can remember the chapter.
   C. Think of what the people or places discussed in the chapter might be like.
   D. Decide if I have enough time to read the chapter.
10. Before I begin reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Check to see if I am understanding the chapter so far.
   B. Check to see if the words have more than one meaning.
   C. Think about how it might relate to previous chapters.
   D. List all of the important details.

II. In each set of four, choose the one statement which tells a good thing to do to help you understand a chapter better *while* you are reading it.

11. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Read the chapter very slowly so that I will not miss any important parts.
   B. Read the title to see what the chapter is about.
   C. Check to see if the pictures have anything missing.
   D. Check to see if the chapter is making sense by seeing if I can tell what it's about so far.
12. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Stop to retell the main points to see if I am understanding what has happened so far.
   B. Read the chapter quickly so that I can find out what happened.
   C. Read only the beginning and the end of the chapter to find out what it is about.
   D. Skip the parts that are too difficult for me.
13. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
   A. Look all of the big words up in the dictionary.
   B. Put the book away and find another one if things aren't making sense.
   C. Keep thinking about the title and the pictures to help me decide how things relate.
   D. Keep track of how many pages I have left to read.

14. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Keep track of how long it is taking me to read the chapter.
    B. Check to see if I can answer any of the questions I asked before I started reading.
    C. Read the title to see what the chapter is going to be about.
    D. Read straight through without looking back.
15. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Have someone read the chapter aloud to me.
    B. Keep track of how many pages I have read.
    C. List the chapter's main idea.
    D. Check to see if my predictions are right or wrong.
16. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Read very slowly to make certain that I don't miss anything.
    B. Make a lot of guesses about what is going to happen next.
    C. Not look at the pictures because they might confuse me.
    D. Read the chapter aloud to someone.
17. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Try to answer the questions I asked myself.
    B. Try not to confuse what I already know with what I'm reading about.
    C. Read the chapter slowly.
    D. Check to see if I am saying the new vocabulary words correctly.
18. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Try to see if my guesses are going to be right or wrong.
    B. Stop to think about every word I don't know.
    C. Decide on why I am reading the chapter.
    D. List what happened first, second, third, and so on.
19. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Concentrate more on the ending of the chapter.
    B. Be careful not to skip any parts of the chapter.
    C. Check to see how many of the words I already know.
    D. Keep thinking of what I already know about the things and ideas in the chapter to help me decide how new information relates to my prior knowledge.
20. While I'm reading, it's a good idea to:
    A. Reread some parts or read ahead to see if I can figure out what is happening if things aren't making sense.
    B. Read very slowly so that I can be sure I understand what it's about.
    C. Do the questions at the end of the chapter.
    D. Say every word in my mind so I can make certain that I know the words.

III. In each set of four, choose the one statement which tells a good thing to do to help you understand a chapter better *after* you have read it.

21. After I've read a chapter, it's a good idea to:
    A. Count how many pages I read with no mistakes.
    B. Check to see if there were enough pictures to go with the chapter to make it interesting.

C. Check to see if I met my purpose for reading the chapter.
D. Immediately answer the questions provided at the end of the chapter.

22. After I've read a chapter, it's a good idea to:
A. Underline the main idea.
B. Retell the main points of the whole chapter so that I can check to see if I understood it.
C. Read the chapter again to be sure I said all of the words right.
D. Practice reading the chapter aloud.

23. After I've read a chapter, it's a good idea to:
A. Read the title and look over the chapter to see what it is about.
B. Check to see if I skipped any of the vocabulary words.
C. Think about how this information might relate to a specific situation.
D. Make a guess about what will happen in the next chapter.

24. After I've read a chapter, it's a good idea to:
A. Look up all of the big words in the dictionary.
B. Read the important parts.
C. Have someone read the chapter aloud to me.
D. Think about how the chapter was like things I already knew about before I started reading.

25. After I've read a chapter, it's a good idea to:
A. Think about why this information is important.
B. Practice reading the chapter aloud.
C. Look over the chapter title and pictures to see what will happen.
D. Look at all titles and subtitles.

Answer Key

1. C.
2. A.
3. B.
4. C.
5. A.
6. B.
7. B.
8. A.
9. C.
10. C.
11. D.
12. A.
13. C.
14. B.
15. D.
16. B.
17. A.
18. A.
19. D.
20. A.
21. C.
22. B.
23. C.
24. D.
25. A.

Adapted from Schmitt, M. A questionnaire to measure children's awareness of strategic reading process, (1990). *The Reading Teacher,* 49, pp. 454–461.

Appendix B

WRITING ASSIGNMENT CHECKLIST

Content	1–4 Weak	5–7 Average	8–10 Strong
1. Clear and interesting topic or main idea.			
2. Topic appropriate to the assignment.			
3. Ideas and details support and develop the topic.			
4. Ideas stated clearly and developed fully.			
5. Good use of language.			
FORM			
6. Introduction, body, and conclusion.			
7. Details arranged logically; appropriate to the topic.			
8. Coherent, paragraphs constructed well.			
MECHANICS			
9. Grammar and usage.			
10. Spelling, capitalization, punctuation.			

COMMENTS:

Key:
Strong—10 points
Average/Strong—7 points
Average—5 points
Weak—3 points

Adapted from checklist developed by Dianne Duncan